United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 162 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JUNE 8, 2016 *No. 90*

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BOST).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
June 8, 2016.

I hereby appoint the Honorable MIKE BOST to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

PAUL D. RYAN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

Reverend Brian Britton, The Dwelling Place Churches, Williamsburg, Virginia, offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, today we are thankful for Your great grace and faithfulness toward our Nation and its leaders.

It is my prayer that You would continue to bless this Congress with Your wisdom, insight, and increased revelation of Your will for this land and its people.

May Your holy spirit guide us into a greater unity with You and with each other. Shed Your light on the pressing issues of this day in such a way that Your glory would increase in the Earth.

Open eyes to see what needs to be seen, ears to hear what needs to be heard, and grant each leader here the courage to do what needs to be done and to say what needs to be said.

Today I declare that this Nation will continue to be a beacon of light, hope, prosperity, justice, and liberty to all the peoples of the Earth.

In Jesus' name, amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. HURT) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. HURT of Virginia led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

WELCOMING REVEREND BRIAN BRITTON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WITTMAN) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize today's guest chaplain, Reverend Brian Britton, and thank him for delivering this morning's invocation.

Reverend Britton serves as the senior pastor of The Dwelling Place Church in Williamsburg, Virginia, where he lives with his wife, Valerie, and daughter, Anastasia. In addition to his work in the First District, Reverend Britton pastors a church in Richmond, Virginia, and travels internationally to act as a missionary to communities in Africa, South America, and Central Asia. Pastor Britton will be leaving tomorrow to pursue his work in Africa.

Our Nation was built on a foundation of faith. Through Reverend Britton, we can all see firsthand how God uses his ministry to eternally impact the lives of men, women, and children of his church, of his community, of his Commonwealth, and of this world.

Thank you, Reverend Britton, for your prayer this morning, and for acting as a spiritual leader to those of the First District. May God continue to bless the Britton family, our Commonwealth, and our country.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, June 8, 2016.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,
The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on June 8, 2016 at 9:27 a.m.:

That the Senate agreed to without amendment H. Con. Res. 119.

That the Senate passed S. 2487.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. After consultation among the Speaker and the majority and minority leaders, and with their consent, the Chair announces that, when the two Houses meet in joint meeting to hear an address by His Excellency Narendra Modi, Prime Minister of the Republic of India, only the doors immediately opposite the Speaker and those immediately to his left and right will be open.

No one will be allowed on the floor of the House who does not have the privilege of the floor of the House. Due to the large attendance that is anticipated, the rule regarding the privilege of the floor must be strictly enforced. Children of Members will not be permitted on the floor. The cooperation of all Members is requested.

The practice of reserving seats prior to the joint meeting by placard will not be allowed. Members may reserve their seats by physical presence only following the security sweep of the Chamber.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday, May 26, 2016, the House stands in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly, (at 10 o'clock and 6 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1050

JOINT MEETING TO HEAR AN ADDRESS BY HIS EXCELLENCY NARENDRA MODI, PRIME MINISTER OF THE REPUBLIC OF INDIA

During the recess, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 10 o'clock and 50 minutes a.m.

The Assistant to the Sergeant at Arms, Ms. Kathleen Joyce, announced the Vice President and Members of the U.S. Senate, who entered the Hall of the House of Representatives, the Vice President taking the chair at the right of the Speaker, and the Members of the Senate the seats reserved for them.

The SPEAKER. The joint meeting will come to order.

The Chair appoints as members of the committee on the part of the House to escort His Excellency Narendra Modi into the Chamber:

The gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE);

The gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS);

The gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN);

The gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MESSER);

The gentlewoman from Kansas (Ms. JENKINS);

The gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE);

The gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HOLDING);

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE);

The gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON);

The gentlewoman from Wyoming (Mrs. LUMMIS);

The gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI);

The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER);

The gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA);

The gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY);

The gentleman from California (Mr. BERA);

The gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT);

The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE);

The gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. GABBARD);

The gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY);

The gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS);

The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN); and

The gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO).

The VICE PRESIDENT. The President of the Senate, at the direction of that body, appoints the following Senators as members of the committee on the part of the Senate to escort His Excellency Narendra Modi into the House Chamber:

The Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL);

The Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN);

The Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH);

The Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT);

The Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO);

The Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER);

The Senator from Tennessee (Mr. CORKER);

The Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN);

The Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN);

The Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY);

The Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW);

The Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR); and

The Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN).

The Assistant to the Sergeant at Arms announced the Acting Dean of the Diplomatic Corps, Her Excellency Hunaina Sultan Ahmed Al Mughairy, the Sultanate of Oman.

The Acting Dean of the Diplomatic Corps entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seat reserved for her.

The Assistant to the Sergeant at Arms announced the Cabinet of the President of the United States.

The members of the Cabinet of the President of the United States entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

At 11 o'clock and 13 minutes a.m., the Sergeant at Arms, the Honorable Paul D. Irving, announced His Excellency Narendra Modi, Prime Minister of the Republic of India.

The Prime Minister of the Republic of India, escorted by the committee of Senators and Representatives, entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and stood at the Clerk's desk.

(Applause, the Members rising.)

The SPEAKER. Members of Congress, I have the high privilege and the distinct honor of presenting to you His Excellency Narendra Modi, Prime Minister of the Republic of India.

(Applause, the Members rising.)

Prime Minister MODI. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Vice President, distinguished Members of the U.S. Congress, ladies and gentlemen, I am deeply honored by the invitation to address this joint meeting of the U.S. Congress.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for opening the door of this magnificent Capitol. This temple of democracy has encouraged and empowered other democracies the world over.

It manifests the spirit of this great Nation which, in Abraham Lincoln's words, ''was conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal.''

In granting me this opportunity, you have honored the world's largest democracy and its 1.25 billion people. As a representative of the world's largest democracy, it is, indeed, a privilege to speak to the leaders of its oldest.

Mr. Speaker, 2 days ago I began my visit by going to the Arlington National Cemetery, the final resting place of many brave soldiers of this great land. I honored their courage and sacrifice for the ideals of freedom and democracy.

It was also the 72nd anniversary of the D-day. On that day, thousands from this great country fought to protect the torch of liberty. They sacrificed their lives so that the world lives in freedom. I applaud, India applauds the great sacrifices of the men and women from the land of the free and the home of the brave in service of mankind.

India knows what this means because our soldiers have fallen in distant battlefields for the same ideals. That is why the threads of freedom and liberty form a strong bond between our two democracies.

Mr. Speaker, our nations may have been shaped by differing histories, cultures, and faiths. Yet, our belief in democracy for our nations and liberty for our countrymen is common.

The idea that all citizens are created equal is a central pillar of the American Constitution. Our founding fathers, too, shared the same belief and sought individual liberty for every citizen of India. There were many who doubted India when, as a newly independent nation, we reposed our faith in democracy. Indeed, wagers were made on our failure. But the people of India did not waver.

Our founders created a modern nation with freedom, democracy, and

equality as the essence of its soul. And, in doing so, they ensured that we continued to celebrate our age-old diversity.

Today, across its individuals and institutions, in its villages and cities, in its streets and states, anchored in equal respect for all faiths, and in the melody of hundreds of its languages and dialects, India lives as one; India grows as one; India celebrates as one.

Mr. Speaker, modern India is in its 70th year. For my government, the constitution is its real holy book. And, in that holy book, freedom of faith, speech and franchise, and equality of all citizens, regardless of background, are enshrined as fundamental rights. Eight hundred million of my countrymen may exercise the freedom of franchise once every 5 years. But all the 1.25 billion of our citizens have freedom from fear, a freedom they exercise every moment of their lives.

Distinguished Members, engagement between our two democracies has been visible in the manner in which our thinkers impacted one another and shaped the course of our societies. Thoreau's idea of civil disobedience influenced our political thoughts. And, similarly, the call by the great sage of India, Swami Vivekananda, to embrace humanity was most famously delivered in Chicago.

Gandhi's nonviolence inspired the heroism of Martin Luther King. Today, a mere distance of 3 miles separates the Martin Luther King Memorial at the Tidal Basin from the statue of Gandhi at Massachusetts Avenue. This proximity of their memorials in Washington mirrors the closeness of ideals and values they believed in.

The genius of Dr. Bhimrao ''Babasaheb'' Ambedkar was nurtured in the years he spent at the Colombia University a century ago. The impact of the U.S. Constitution on him was reflected in his drafting of the Indian constitution some three decades later.

Our independence was ignited by the same idealism that fueled your struggle for freedom. No wonder, then, that former Prime Minister of India, Atal Bihari Vajpayee, called India and the U.S. ''natural allies.'' No wonder that the shared ideals and common philosophy of freedom shaped the bedrock of our ties. No wonder, then, that President Obama has called our ties the defining partnership of the 21st century.

Mr. Speaker, more than 15 years ago, Prime Minister Vajpayee stood here and gave a call to step out of the ''shadow of hesitation'' of the past. The pages of our friendship since then tell a remarkable story.

Today, our relationship has overcome the hesitations of history. Comfort, candor, and convergence define our conversations. Through the cycle of elections and transitions of administrations, the intensity of our engagements has only grown. And, in this exciting journey, the U.S. Congress has acted as its compass. You helped us turn barriers into bridges of partnership.

In the fall of 2008, when the Congress passed the India-U.S. Civil Nuclear Cooperation Agreement, it changed the very colors of leaves of our relationship. We thank you for being there when the partnership needed you the most.

You have also stood by us in times of sorrow. India will never forget the solidarity shown by the U.S. Congress when terrorists from across our border attacked Mumbai in November of 2008. And for this, we are grateful.

Mr. Speaker, I am informed that the working of the U.S. Congress is harmonious. I am also told that you are well known for your bipartisanship. Well, you are not alone. Time and again, I have also witnessed a similar spirit in the Indian Parliament, especially in our upper House. So, as you can see, we have many shared practices.

Mr. Speaker, as this country knows well, every journey has its pioneers. Very early on, they shaped a development partnership, even when the meeting ground was more limited. The genius of Norman Borlaug brought the Green Revolution and food security to my country. The excellence of the American universities nurtured institutions of technology and management in India. And I could go on, but fast forward to the present.

The embrace of our partnership extends to the totality of human endeavor, from the depths of the oceans to the vastness of the space. Our science and technology collaboration continues to help us in cracking the age-old problems in the fields of public health, education, food, and agriculture.

Ties of commerce and investment are flourishing. We trade more with the U.S. than with any other nation. And the flow of goods, services, and capital between us generates jobs in both our societies.

As in trade, so in defense. India exercises with the United States more than we do with any other partner. Defense purchases have moved from almost zero to $10 billion in less than a decade. Our cooperation also secures our cities and citizens from terrorists, and protects our critical infrastructure from cyber threats. Civil nuclear cooperation, as I told President Obama yesterday, is a reality.

Mr. Speaker, our people-to-people links are strong, and there is a close cultural connect between our societies.

Siri—you are familiar with the Siri. Siri tells us that India's ancient heritage of yoga has over 30 million practitioners in the U.S. It is estimated that more Americans bend for yoga than to throw a curve ball.

And, no, Mr. Speaker, we have not yet claimed intellectual property right on yoga.

Connecting our two nations is also a unique and dynamic bridge of 3 million Indian Americans. Today, they are among your best CEOs, academics, astronauts, scientists, economists, doctors, even spelling bee champions.

They are your strength. They are also the pride of India. They symbolize the best of both of our societies.

Mr. Speaker, my understanding of your great country began long before I entered public office. Long before assuming office, I traveled coast to coast, covering more than 25 States of America.

I realized then that the real strength of the U.S. was in the dreams of its people and the boldness of their ambitions.

Today, Mr. Speaker, a similar spirit animates India. Our 800 million youth are especially impatient. India is undergoing a profound social and economic change.

A billion of its citizens are already politically empowered. My dream is to economically empower them through many social and economic transformations and do so by 2022, the 75th anniversary of India's independence.

My to-do list is long and ambitious but, you will understand, it includes: a vibrant rural economy with a robust farm sector; a roof over each head and electricity for all households; to skill millions of our youth; build 100 smart cities; have broadband for a billion, and connect our villages to the digital world; and create a 21st century rail, road, and port infrastructure.

These are not just aspirations: they are goals to be reached in a finite time frame, and to be achieved with a light carbon footprint, with greater emphasis on renewables.

Mr. Speaker, in every sector of India's forward march, I see the U.S. as an indispensable partner. Many of you also believe that a stronger and prosperous India is in America's strategic interest.

Let us work together to convert shared ideals into practical cooperation. There can be no doubt that, in advancing this relationship, both nations stand to gain.

As the U.S. businesses search for new areas of economic growth, markets for their goods, a pool of skilled resources, and a global location to produce and manufacture, India could be their ideal partner.

India's strong economy and growth rate of 7.6 percent per annum is creating a new opportunity for our mutual prosperity.

Transformative American technologies in India and growing investment by Indian companies in the United States both have a positive impact on the lives of our citizens. Today, for their global research and development centers, India is the destination of choice for the U.S. companies.

Looking eastward from India, across the Pacific, the innovation strength of our two countries comes together in California. Here, the innovative genius of America and India's intellectual creativity are working to shape new industries of the future.

Mr. Speaker, the 21st century has brought with it great opportunities, but it has also come with its own set of challenges.

While some parts of the world are islands of growing economic prosperity,

others are mired in conflicts. In Asia, the absence of an agreed security architecture creates uncertainty. Threats of terror are expanding, and new challenges are emerging in cyber and outer space.

And global institutions conceived in the 20th century seem unable to cope with new challenges or take on new responsibilities. In this world full of multiple transitions and economic opportunities, growing uncertainties and political complexities, existing threats and new challenges, our engagement can make a difference by promoting: cooperation, not dominance; connectivity, not isolation; inclusive, not exclusive, mechanisms; respect for global commons; and, above all, adherence to international rules and norms.

India is already assuming her responsibilities in securing the Indian Ocean region. A strong India-U.S. partnership can anchor peace, prosperity, and stability from Asia to Africa and from the Indian Ocean to the Pacific. It can also help ensure security of the sea lanes of commerce and freedom of navigation on the seas. But the effectiveness of our cooperation would increase if international institutions, framed with the mind-set of the 20th century, were to reflect the realities of today.

Mr. Speaker, before arriving in Washington, D.C., I had visited Herat, in western Afghanistan, to inaugurate the Afghan-India Friendship Dam, built with Indian assistance. I was also there on Christmas Day last year to dedicate to that proud nation its Parliament, a testimony to our democratic ties.

Afghans naturally recognize that the sacrifices of Americans have helped create a better life, but your contribution in keeping the region safe and secure is deeply appreciated even beyond.

India, too, has made an enormous contribution and sacrifices to support our friendship with the Afghan people. A commitment to rebuild a peaceful, stable, and prosperous Afghanistan is our shared objective.

Yet, distinguished Members, not just in Afghanistan, but elsewhere in south Asia and globally, terrorism remains the biggest threat. In the territory stretching from west of India's border to Africa, it may go by different names, from Lashkar-e-Taiba, to Taliban, to ISIS, but its philosophy is common: of hate, murder, and violence. Although, its shadow is spreading across the world, it is incubated in India's neighborhood.

I commend the Members of the U.S. Congress for sending a clear message to those who preach and practice terrorism for political gains. Refusing to reward them is the first step towards holding them accountable for their actions.

The fight against terrorism has to be fought at many levels, and the traditional tools of military, intelligence, or diplomacy alone would not be able to win this fight.

Mr. Speaker, we have both lost civilians and soldiers in combating terrorism. The need of the hour is for us to deepen our security cooperation and base it on a policy that isolates those who harbor, support, and sponsor terrorists; that does not distinguish between ''good'' and ''bad'' terrorists; and that delinks religion from terrorism.

Also, for us to succeed, those who believe in humanity must come together to fight for it as one, and speak against this menace in one voice. Terrorism must be delegitimized.

Mr. Speaker, the benefits of our partnership extend not just to the nations and regions that need it most. On our own, and by combining our capacities, we are also responding to other global challenges, including when disaster strikes and where humanitarian relief is needed. Far from our shores, we evacuated thousands from Yemen—Indians, Americans, and others. Nearer home, we were the first responders during Nepal's earthquake, in the Maldives water crisis, and, most recently, during the landslide in Sri Lanka.

We are also one of the largest contributors of troops to U.N. peacekeeping operations. Often, India and the U.S. have combined their strengths in science, technology, and innovation to help fight hunger, poverty, diseases, and illiteracy in different parts of the world. The success of our partnership is also opening up new opportunities for learning, security, and development from Asia to Africa.

And the protection of the environment and caring for the planet is central to our shared vision of a just world. For us in India, to live in harmony with Mother Earth is part of our ancient belief, and to take from nature only what is most essential is part of our Indian culture.

Our partnership, therefore, aims to balance responsibilities with capabilities, and it also focuses on new ways to increase the availability and use of renewable energy.

A strong U.S. support for our initiative to form an International Solar Alliance is one such effort. We are working together not just for a better future for ourselves, but for the whole world. This has also been the goal of our efforts in G20, East Asia Summit, and climate change summits.

Mr. Speaker, as we deepen our partnership, there would be times when we would have differing perspectives; but since our interests and concerns converge, the autonomy in decisionmaking and diversity in our perspectives can only add value to our partnership.

So, as we embark on a new journey and seek new goals, let us focus not just on matters routine, but also transformational ideas, ideas which can focus not just on creating wealth, but also creating value for our societies; not just on immediate gains, but also long-term benefits; not just on sharing best practices, but also shaping partnerships; and not just on building a bright future for our peoples, but in being a bridge to a more united, humane, and prosperous world.

And important for the success of this journey would be a need to view it with new eyes and new sensitivities. When we do this, we will realize the full promise of this extraordinary relationship.

Mr. Speaker, in my final thoughts and words, let me emphasize that our relationship is primed for a momentous future. The constraints of the past are behind us, and foundations of the future are firmly in place.

In the lines of Walt Whitman: ''The orchestra have sufficiently tuned their instruments; the baton has given the signal.'' And to that, if I might add, there is a new symphony in play.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Vice President, and distinguished Members, for this honor.

Thank you very much.

(Applause, the Members rising.)

At 12 o'clock and 11 minutes p.m., His Excellency Narendra Modi, Prime Minister of the Republic of India, accompanied by the committee of escort, retired from the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The Assistant to the Sergeant at Arms escorted the invited guests from the Chamber in the following order:

The members of the President's Cabinet;

The Acting Dean of the Diplomatic Corps.

JOINT MEETING DISSOLVED

The SPEAKER. The purpose of the joint meeting having been completed, the Chair declares the joint meeting of the two Houses now dissolved.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 13 minutes p.m.), the joint meeting of the two Houses was dissolved.

The Members of the Senate retired to their Chamber.

The SPEAKER. The House will continue in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1246

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of New York) at 12 o'clock and 46 minutes p.m.

PRINTING OF PROCEEDINGS HAD DURING RECESS

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings had during the recess be printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4775, OZONE STANDARDS IMPLEMENTATION ACT OF 2016; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. CON. RES. 89, EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF CONGRESS THAT A CARBON TAX WOULD BE DETRIMENTAL TO THE UNITED STATES ECONOMY; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. CON. RES. 112, EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF CONGRESS OPPOSING THE PRESIDENT'S PROPOSED $10 TAX ON EVERY BARREL OF OIL

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 767 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 767

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4775) to facilitate efficient State implementation of ground-level ozone standards, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Energy and Commerce now printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House any concurrent resolution specified in section 3 of this resolution. All points of order against consideration of each such concurrent resolution are waived. Each such concurrent resolution shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in each such concurrent resolution are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on each such concurrent resolution and preamble to adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

SEC. 3. The concurrent resolutions referred to in section 2 of this resolution are as follows:

(1) The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 89) expressing the sense of Congress that a carbon tax would be detrimental to the United States economy.

(2) The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 112) expressing the sense of Congress opposing the President's proposed $10 tax on every barrel of oil.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), my good friend, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 767 provides a structured rule for the consideration of three bills. You heard the reading Clerk read them, but I will read them again: H.R. 4775, Ozone Standards Implementation Act; H. Con. Res. 89, Expressing the Sense of Congress that a Carbon Tax would be Detrimental to the United States Economy; and, H. Con. Res. 112, Expressing the Sense of Congress Opposing the President's Proposed $10 Tax on Every Barrel of Oil.

It is a little unusual that we put three different bills into a single rule, but today has been a bit of an unusual day. It has been a bit of an unusual day.

Mr. Speaker, it is no surprise to you, standing not 3 feet from where you were just 30 minutes ago was the leader of a democracy of 1.3 billion people. That is 1.3 billion people. In the midst of his remarks, he commented on the reputation of the United States Congress, known far and wide around the globe. He commented on the comity—that is with an i-t-y, not an e-d-y—that we have been known for. And I hope this rule will be no exception, Mr. Speaker.

We are not going to agree on all the underlying bills, all the underlying policy, but what we can agree on is that this Congress needs to have its voice heard.

If we approve this rule today—and I recommend to all of my colleagues that we do approve this rule today—we will be able to get to the underlying debate. And in the underlying debate, Mr. Speaker, we have two senses of Congress and a piece of legislation—a piece of legislation for which amendments were submitted to the Rules Committee to say that we have ideas as Members of this body about how we can improve the underlying bill.

One of them came from my friend from Colorado. I don't particularly support the idea that he is pushing, but I support his right to have the idea heard on the floor of the House. This rule makes the Polis amendment in order, along with every other non-duplicative amendment submitted. I add non-duplicative because virtually the same amendment was submitted by two different Members and we decided to debate it once instead of twice, as is customary.

We are going to disagree, but we are going to have the debate over those disagreements. And my great hope is that the work product we produce will be a stronger work product because we have had an opportunity to discuss it here on the floor. My great hope is that, after we have had a chance to perfect that work product, we will send it on to the Senate with a big bipartisan vote from both parties.

Mr. Speaker, it is easy to talk about taxes as if they don't come from someone. When we have an academic conversation about tax policy, what is the saying? Don't tax him, don't tax me, tax the man behind that tree.

I have heard folks say: You are always trying to put the tax burden on somebody else.

What the President proposed was $10 a barrel on every barrel of oil consumed in America. Now, historically, we have had some low oil prices of late. That $10 a barrel tax would have amounted to almost a 50 percent increase in the cost of a barrel of oil. Today it is going to be closer to a 20 percent increase in the cost of a barrel of oil.

This tax is implemented in the name of what, Mr. Speaker?

It is in the name of improving our failing infrastructure because we do need to improve our failing infrastructure. We do have to have a conversation about user fees in this country and how it is we are going to build the best logistical system the world has ever known. But that is not what this tax would do.

This is a tax that is part of what has been a long campaign against the consumption of any fossil fuels whatsoever. My great frustration, Mr. Speaker, is that if your goal is to reduce the consumption of fossil fuels, we have a lot of ways we can do that. We have a lot of very reasonable ways we can do that. And this proposal makes no effort to try to find the most efficient way to make that happen. It is a blanket $10 a barrel tax across the board.

If you are using that barrel of oil to generate space-age plastics, Mr. Speaker, and you are going to use those

space-age plastics to build the most efficient photovoltaic cell array the world has ever known, such as is going on in my district, there is no special dispensation for you.

In the name of trying to create a better environment, we will tax the very inputs that we are encouraging folks to use in order to create a better environment. It doesn't make sense, Mr. Speaker. Folks use it as a bumper sticker line. It is a campaign year.

That uncertainty has an impact on job creation. That uncertainty has an impact on where these funds around the globe go toward trying to create a better environment for us all—where those funds land, where those jobs are created.

Today this House takes a stand. Today this House makes it clear, even in an election year, even in the uncertainty of a political season, even in this time of conflict on policy, that we can provide some certainty out there for not just the American business community, but the international business community.

There is one thing I think that we can all agree on, Mr. Speaker, and that is that America has the most productive workforce the world has ever known. If given a level playing field, there is not a single opportunity that we cannot succeed in. If we commit ourselves to it, we can succeed.

Lower-paying jobs, cheaper finger jobs are always going to go overseas, but the higher-paying jobs, the higher-skilled jobs, the energy-intensive jobs, those jobs can come here.

We have an extraordinary disadvantage in this country in that we have the single worst Tax Code in the world. The single worst. If you want to create a business, if you want to grow jobs, don't come to America is the tag line that the Tax Code suggests. No one punishes productivity more than we do in America. It is nonsense. We can absolutely fix it. The Speaker and our Ways and Means Committee chairman, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY), are working incredibly hard to make that happen.

If we go from worst to first in terms of a competitive job code, we bring more jobs to this country. But number two, we have an advantage that no one else does, in that we have gone from being worried during the Carter administration that we would exhaust all of our energy reserves to having the largest energy reserves this Nation has ever known.

If you need to produce a product that requires high energy inputs, I challenge you to find a better location than the United States of America. Those jobs are coming here. We have an advantage for job creators here. And what the President would do in his budget is to give that advantage away. And for what? Not because of a coherent energy policy designed to make the world a better place, make the environment a better environment, and the health of American citizens better, but in the name of pursuing an agenda of no fossil fuels—nowhere, nohow.

I am glad we are down here having this conversation today, Mr. Speaker. It is one that needs to be had. It is one that has been a long time coming. But we have an opportunity today to speak with one voice in this body. I hope we will speak with one voice in supporting this rule and speak with one voice in supporting the three underlying resolutions.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I thank the gentleman for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I am excited to be here today discussing one of these resolutions because it really means something when Members of Congress see fit—and I am talking about the Scalise resolution, H. Con. Res. 89, to say they are against a particular proposal.

Quite honestly, this is the first sign of momentum for a carbon tax cut. And you will hear me referring to it as a ''carbon tax cut'' because that is essentially what it is. It is using carbon tax revenues to cut taxes for the American people, for American businesses.

□ 1300

You don't see these kinds of resolutions if a concept and an idea don't have momentum.

For instance, my good friend from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL) has long been a champion of a proposal to create a sales tax here in our country, a national sales tax of 19, 20 percent, and he is welcome to talk about it on his own time.

But I think the gentleman will acknowledge, much to his frustration, that that idea does not seem to be advancing. Now, were it advancing, you might very well see this kind of resolution saying it is not a good idea.

There are other Republicans who have ideas to raise the tax rates on low-income Americans or Americans that are so low-income they might not even be paying a Federal income tax yet. Again, those ideas don't generally have momentum, so you don't see this kind of resolution coming forward to try to stop it.

This is the first real chance that Congress has had to vote, in many ways, on the merits of a carbon tax cut and, frankly, I think that this discussion moves us forward, because I fully expect there will be bipartisan opposition to this resolution which opposes, presumably, any and all carbon tax cuts, because what you see is, the oil and gas lobby or, I should say, some segments of the oil and gas lobby because, quite frankly, many international oil and gas industry players actually support a carbon tax cut as a way of their, therefore, getting around this kind of regulatory uncertainty that they see, like, in fact, the ozone rules itself. They see it better to simply establish a price for carbon.

But let's say, of course, there are also those in the oil and gas industry who oppose this carbon tax cut. They are trying to run a strategy to try to lock people down, where, yes, maybe, 10, 5, 12 Republicans will vote for this, whatever it is; but they want to be able to go back and remind Republicans who vote for this now that, in the future, when we are actually moving forward with the carbon tax cut proposal, that they were already on the Record in a particular way.

That means they are worried, frankly. That is what that means in ''inside the Beltway speak'' and ''Washington speak.''

What does that mean? It means I am excited because I ran for Congress, in part, to pass a carbon tax cut.

Let me quote some of the many prominent conservatives that have caused this resolution to come forward in many ways because of the great momentum that a carbon tax cut has.

Former Secretary of State George Shultz, Secretary of State under Ronald Reagan, said: ''A carbon tax, starting small and escalating to a significant level on a legislated schedule, would do the trick. I would make it revenue-neutral, returning all net funds generated to taxpayers.''

That is Former Secretary of State George Shultz.

Jerry Taylor, of the Niskanen Center, formerly of the Cato Institute, said: ''A carbon tax at the levels presently discussed in Washington would not unduly burden the economy, and that's particularly true once we consider the non-climate environmental benefits that would follow from the tax as well as the benefits of any offsetting tax cuts.''

So in a moment you will hear me talk about the many benefits of this carbon tax cut concept. But what Jerry Taylor at the Niskanen Center has rightfully latched onto is the economic stimulus that can actually be generated by lowering taxes on American businesses, on job creators, on middle-income families as an offset from the carbon tax cut.

Peter Van Doren of the Cato Institute says: ''The obvious lesson from economics is to increase fossil fuel prices enough through taxation to account for these effects.''

My good friend, and a personal mentor of mine, Dr. Arthur Laffer, former Economic Adviser under President Reagan, said: ''When you add the national security concerns, reducing our reliance on fossil fuels becomes a no-brainer.'' And he has spoken out in support of, again, a carbon tax cut.

Greg Mankiw, the former chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers to George Bush, said: ''I will tell the American people that a higher tax on gasoline is better at encouraging conservation than are heavy-handed CAFE regulations,'' and ''I will advocate a carbon tax as the best way to control global warming.''

So, I mean, what you have is many conservatives, free market conservatives lining up to say yes, let's cut

taxes and let's do it by passing a carbon tax cut.

I have a letter, Mr. Speaker, that I will include in the RECORD, signed by Niskanen Center, Republican, American Enterprise Institute, R Street Institute, Evangelical Environmental Network in opposition to this resolution by Representative SCALISE.

In fact, in part, this letter says, which will be available in the RECORD: ''The least burdensome, most straightforward, and most market-friendly means of addressing climate change is to price the risks imposed by greenhouse gas emissions via a tax.''

JUNE 7, 2016.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE, Later this week Congress will take up a resolution sponsored by Congressman Scalise (R-LA1) that expresses the sense of Congress that a carbon tax would be detrimental to the economy of the United States. We are concerned that this resolution offers a limited perspective on carbon taxes and is blind to the potential benefits of market-based climate policy. Legislation that incorporates a carbon tax could include regulatory and tax reforms to make the United States economy more competitive, innovative, and robust, benefiting both present and future generations.

We recognize that a carbon tax, like any tax, will impose economic costs. But climate change is also imposing economic costs. This resolution falls short by recognizing the cost of action without considering the cost of staying on our present policy course. There are, of course, uncertainties about the future cost of climate change and, likewise, the cost associated with a carbon tax (much would depend on program design and the pace and nature of technological progress). The need for action, however, is clear. A recent survey of economists who publish in leading peer-reviewed journals on these matters found that 93% believe that a meaningful policy response to climate change is warranted.

The least burdensome, most straightforward, and most market-friendly means of addressing climate change is to price the risks imposed by greenhouse gas emissions via a tax. This would harness price signals, rather than regulations, to guide market response. That is why carbon pricing has the support of free market economists, a majority of the global business community, and a large number of the largest multinational private oil and gas companies in the world (the corporate entities among the most directly affected by climate policy).

In reaching a conclusion, this resolution neglects the fact that the United States already has a multiplicity of carbon taxes. They are imposed, however, via dozens of federal and state regulations, are invisible to consumers, unevenly imposed across industrial sectors, unnecessarily costly, and growing in size and scope. The policy choice is not if we should price carbon emissions, but how.

Unfortunately, this resolution also fails to differentiate between proposals that would impose carbon taxes on top of existing regulations (chiefly the Obama Administration's Clean Power Plan), and proposals that would impose carbon taxes in place of those existing regulations. Conservatives and free market advocates should embrace the latter, regardless of how they view climate risks.

An economy-wide carbon tax that replaces existing regulatory interventions could reduce the cost of climate policy and deregulate the economy. It could also provide revenue to support pro-growth tax reform, including corporate income or payroll tax cuts, which could dramatically reduce overall costs on the economy. Revenues could be applied to compensate those who suffer the most from higher energy costs; the poor, the elderly, and individuals and families living on fixed incomes.

Unfortunately, none of those options are presently available because Members of Congress have neglected opportunities to design and debate market-friendly climate policies in legislation. Instead, they have yielded authority in climate policy design to the Executive Branch. By discouraging a long-overdue discussion about sensible carbon pricing, this resolution frustrates the development of better policy.

Sincerely,

JERRY TAYLOR,
President, Niskanen Center.
BOB INGLIS,
Executive Director, RepublicEn.
APARNA MATHUR,
Resident Scholar, American Enterprise Institute.
ELI LEHRER,
President, R Street Institute.
THE REV. MITCHELL C. HESCOX,
President, Evangelical Environmental Network.
ALAN VIARD,
Resident Scholar, American Enterprise Institute.

Mr. POLIS. Now, let's take this back to basic economics. The Supreme Court itself said something along the lines of: power to tax is the power to destroy. That is from an early 19th century case.

Whatever you tax, you discourage in the economy. Whatever you don't tax, you encourage. So you have to look at what you tax. It's important.

Let's take an example from corporations. We tax corporate profits. Well, it turns out corporate profits are a good thing. We tax individual income. It turns out individual income is a good thing.

As policymakers, we shouldn't seek to discourage activities that help people earn money or help companies earn money. That is exactly what we want people to do. That is exactly what we want companies to do on behalf of their shareholders and their stakeholders.

So why not take something that, regardless of what with you think of the science on climate change—and that is not central to this debate on a carbon tax cut. So let's even start from the assumption that you don't want to look at the science. You have turned a blind eye to it. You are not at all concerned about climate change, or you don't think it is manmade.

Let's look, again, at carbon usage in our economy and the negative consequences of it: pollution, meaning air quality—not talking climate change—air quality, increased asthma, increased cancer risk.

National security's concerns, reliant on importing it from foreign companies or, if we are producing it domestically, utilizing a resource that we know will return out in the very best-case scenario. It is a perishable resource. Once you take it out of the ground, it is gone.

So if we can find a way to say, you know what? We would rather have income. We would rather have Americans of all income levels—whether they are earning $1 million a year, or $20,000 a year—we would rather have them keep more of their hard-earned money. We would rather have companies keep more of their money to re-invest in job growth here, rather than seek elaborate tax shelters overseas, or inversions, where they move their corporate headquarters overseas because we have one of the highest corporate tax rates in the world.

The carbon tax cut presents us with the opportunity for pro-growth economic policies that make America more competitive and lets Americans keep more of their hard-earned money.

That is what excites so many free-market conservatives and centrists about the concept of a free market, of a carbon tax cut. That is, frankly, why this great momentum, coming from the American Enterprise Institute, from Cato, from R Street, all of this intellectual fuel, intellectual fuel for a carbon tax cut, that is why, sensing that, some Republicans—in this case, Mr. SCALISE and his cosponsors—have brought forward as a response. This kind of thing only happens in Washington when an idea has momentum.

I couldn't have been more excited when I was back home recently to talk to several of my constituents who are strongly dedicated to a bipartisan solution on climate change.

Former Representative Bob Inglis actually came to my district and met with me, met with some of the leadership folks in my district about how we can do something to act on climate from a Republican perspective. And I am firmly of the belief that any action has to be bipartisan.

Just looking at the way our country is balanced, I mean, certainly, if the Democrats were in a position where we had 60 seats in the Senate, where we had a majority in the House, where we had the President, I would certainly encourage us to move forward and implement some kind of carbon tax cut; but, frankly, that is an unlikely scenario.

It is more likely that a solution will require support from both sides of the aisle, so we should be talking about what it takes to get that kind of support. That is the discussion, the national discussion that former Representative Bob Inglis has dedicated himself to and, frankly, it is the fear of that kind of discussion that has led this body to consider this resolution in opposition to a carbon tax cut that, I am proud to say, will likely have bipartisan opposition; meaning, there will be some Republicans, I hope, I expect, who will stand up and say, wait a minute. I don't want to go on the

RECORD saying I am against any kind of carbon tax cut because of the great benefit that this can provide to the American economy.

As articulated by Arthur Laffer, as articulated by R Street Institute, we have the ability, with some of that revenue, to really pass pro-growth tax cuts to offset the income and the revenue from the carbon tax cut.

So the carbon tax cut can reduce the income tax for American families of all income levels. I should point out, Democrats care that lower-income families spend a higher percentage of their income on fuel, on energy. And we have, in many of the bipartisan concept proposals that are out there, tracked tax credits and tax refunds for low-income families to make sure that anything we do is not regressive. I think that is a given.

I think, obviously, in the same week that the Speaker of the House put out his agenda on poverty, I am sure that he, and many others—the last thing they would want to do is burden lower-income Americans with any kind of additional tax. So of course we want to take care of that.

The good news is that is only a small fraction of the windfall from the carbon tax cut. It also provides sufficient revenue to reduce corporate tax rates currently among the highest in the world. Of all the developed countries, a 35 percent corporate tax rate. The developed country average is somewhere in the 18, 20 percent range last time I checked. It is one of the reasons that corporations are moving overseas. They are not repatriating their earnings because they don't want to pay that American income tax.

In a global economy, you have to be competitive. It doesn't mean we have to be the lowest. That is not the value proposition of our country. We have the rule of law. We have a highly educated workforce, but we have to be competitive.

So if we can find a way to reduce that corporate tax rate to 25 percent or 20 percent—I applaud the work of Dave Camp, the former Ways and Means chair last session, who boldly proposed a 25 percent income tax rate. The President of the United States, Barack Obama, has proposed a 28 percent corporate income tax rate. So in that range. And that is, by the way, without a carbon tax cut.

With a carbon tax cut you can go lower on the corporate income tax. You could run the numbers. You could probably get down to 20 percent. Maybe you could get down to 15 percent. It depends how you allocated it. But that is one of the things that excites many of the strong free market advocates of the carbon tax cut.

You could also reduce the individual tax burden for families across all income levels, after we make darn sure that low-income families are not in any way disproportionately hit. And in no way is this regressive. In fact, Democrats' preference would prefer this to be accretive for low-income families, and maybe that is something we can come together around. Certainly something that Democrats and Republicans care about are those who live in poverty and making sure that they, too, see the benefits of the windfall from the carbon tax cut.

But, of course, we are also very open—I am, and my Democratic colleagues—to sharing the benefits of the carbon tax cut across the entire spectrum of income earners, with a focus, we hope, on the middle class, with a focus, we hope, on those in poverty.

But it does provide an opportunity for Republicans who come to the table around climate, around carbon tax cut to say, you know what? Our priorities include job creators and others which, of course, we all care about job creators, we all about care about S Corps, we all care about all those things.

It is simply a matter of priorities. You have to get the revenues to run the government from somewhere. And, separately, we have the discussion about what those appropriation levels are, how much we spend; we have that discussion.

Then we have to, somehow, get so much in taxes. It is a question of where it is from. And I believe it should be from things that, regardless of what you believe on climate, we want to discourage, rather than things that we want to encourage.

So if we can stop discouraging people from earning money and income, stop discouraging corporations from domiciling their earnings here, from growing, from expanding and, instead, discourage something that, even if you throw out the science on climate, is polluting, and runs out, and is a national security danger because it forces us to rely on other countries, that is something that we should discourage in our economy.

So, look, I join George Shultz, Jerry Taylor, Peter Van Doren, Dr. Arthur Laffer, Greg Mankiw, the American Enterprise Institute, and so many others, in saying: the time is now to have this discussion.

I applaud Representative SCALISE for initiating this discussion. This is the first sign of momentum that this bill has. And the day that this body considers a bill condemning my friend from Georgia's national sales tax proposal, I will actually start worrying about it. I will actually start saying wait a minute.

I have had many discussions with him, and I have to say it does have its merits. My issues and concerns with it have been around whether or not we can make it progressive rather than regressive and, of course, the potential for black market transactions when you have that level of taxation. It's a hypothetical discussion at this point.

But the day that a resolution comes forth like H.R. 89 around the national sales tax, I will know that that discussion has become a serious one. And I couldn't be more proud and excited that the discussion around a national carbon tax cut has now become a serious one, a bipartisan one, an inevitable one, one that we will see through with the next President of the United States into law.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, with that level of agreement, I am prepared to tell my friend I don't have any speakers remaining, and if he is prepared to close, we will get right to the underlying bill and exercise that enthusiasm.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I don't have any other speakers, so I will be happy to close.

I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to address some of the issues in this rule and in this bill. This rule, which I oppose, and I also oppose all three underlying bills, contain a number of concepts that aren't going to move forward into law, that are put there for political reasons and, again, very excitingly, the first real discussion of a national carbon tax cut, because that idea has so much bipartisan momentum from the left and the right.

□ 1315

Many of these ideas are simply recycling old ideas, the same ideas that we have discussed before, that they have complained about before that if somehow they were to make it out of the Senate, the President would veto them, particularly, obviously, one that undoes what the President wants to do, so we are simply going through the motions on a lot of these bills. The most notable one is truly the resolution on a carbon tax cut because what this means is that idea has scared enough people, presumably, who oppose it that it is moving forward in some form and some discussion, which is exciting.

So let's start with discussing the proposed $10-per-barrel fee on oil. Now, this is, again, kind of a reaction to something that isn't happening. It is not going to change any current policy. There is no $10-per-barrel fee on oil. This is simply about a Chamber saying that they disapprove of something that Obama has said and wants to do.

We all agree our country has serious problems with transportation and infrastructure funding. There are many different ways that we can meet the needs to fund those. If people don't like a per-barrel fee on oil, there are plenty of other ways to do it.

The real discussion should be about how do we fund transportation?

I am a fan of our bipartisan proposal to allow a repatriation window for funds that corporations have income overseas which they have not brought back to our country because they effectively face another tax with that and a one-time window for doing that. We can create a national infrastructure bank to fund infrastructure.

There are a lot of great ideas. It is clear—and this will probably pass—the Republicans don't like a $10-per-barrel tax on oil, and that is fine.

If you don't like it, what do you like? How do we want to fund infrastructure?

This proposal and this concept came from the administration's 2017 budget. Frankly, there are probably a lot of things in the President's budget that my Republican friends don't like. They could probably run a resolution every week, they could probably run 10 resolutions every week about things that they don't like in the President's budget, but that is not really a productive use of this Chamber's time. That budget didn't pass. As far as I know, I don't think that budget got a single vote.

It wasn't put up this year because Republicans haven't even put up any budgets for our body. They haven't offered a budget. The last time the Republicans put budgets forward—and I believe the last budget, if I am not mistaken, did not contain the $10-per-barrel tax on oil. That was in the President's budget for fiscal year 2017, but the prior one did not receive any votes from Democrats or Republicans.

So this vote, at best, is repetitive because already this body has rejected the President's last budget. Were the Republicans to bring forward the President's budget for 2017, they would likely—again, as has traditionally occurred, as far as I know, throughout history—overwhelmingly reject that budget.

So, in part, let me be clear, that is because we believe, I believe as a Member of Congress, that the budget is a legislative prerogative. I don't think there has been a Presidential budget that has been passed. In fact, I and, I think, most, if not all, of my Democratic colleagues joined in opposing the President's budget because we had our own congressional Democrats' budget. Not only one, there were two or three congressional Democratic budgets, and there were several Republican budgets, but that is a matter of legislative prerogative. We, of course, want to hear ideas from the chief executive, whoever she is, but we also want to implement our own budget because it is our prerogative as the United States Congress with the power of the purse to do that.

But considering the fact that Big Oil and Gas get huge tax subsidies every year, I personally believe that this kind of modest oil fee is a reasonable way to look at and have in the mix when talking about how to fund infrastructure.

If there are other ideas—people have talked about vehicle miles driven, people have talked about a number of different ways. There is no Republican or Democratic road. We all drive on roads. We all need roads. We all need bridges. I know the Republicans in good faith, along with Democrats, know we need to fund our national infrastructure. And if you don't like a particular way of doing that, by all means, put other ideas on the table. But it isn't productive, and it doesn't move anything forward just to take one item from a President's budget that you didn't even allow to have a vote and that very few people support and say: We don't like that.

I think we knew that before you had the vote. I think we knew you didn't like the President's budget overall. You are welcome to have the vote. It isn't going anywhere. It won't pass the Senate. It isn't a matter for actual consideration.

Next, we have the sense of Congress on the carbon tax cut. Again, I couldn't be more excited. I have been feeling from my friends on the right that there has been more interest in this concept of a carbon tax cut. I really see that coming to fruition that it is actually serious enough and mainstream enough that those who don't like the concept are putting up some kind of proactive defense. So I really think it is a matter of time. I think it is going to be great for our economy that we can cut taxes for American businesses, for job creators, and for middle income. We can make sure it is progressive and doesn't additionally burden many of those in poverty. It can be a net benefit to incomes of individuals below the poverty line. I couldn't be more excited about this concept of a carbon tax cut.

Frankly, it is the first discussion on the floor of that concept, I believe, since Republicans have taken control of this body, and I think it is a harbinger of many things to come on something that can be great and, frankly, supported from across the ideological spectrum to make our country more competitive.

Finally, I want to move to what is being called the Ozone Standards Implementation. Now, this also feels like we have been here before and done that before. It feels a little bit like deja vu because this bill essentially repackages a bunch of bills attacking Ozone Standards and the Clean Air Act that we have seen here and voted on over the last several years.

Again, this bill won't pass the Senate. It certainly wouldn't be signed by the President. It is not clear why we are doing it. It seems to be filling our time, but I would hope that we have more important issues to work on on behalf of the American people. Like, for instance, the public health threat of the Zika virus is one.

How about bringing up a bipartisan constitutional amendment that will help us move towards a balanced budget? How about improving our entitlement programs to make sure they are there for the next generation of Americans? How about passing comprehensive immigration reform to restore the order of law and allow 10 million people to come out of the shadows and work legally and abide by their responsibilities under American law that we can enforce going forward?

I am glad that one of my amendments to the ozone bill was made in order. My colleague from Georgia mentioned that. He said he may not personally be supportive of it. I will certainly be making the case for my fourth time and hoping to gain his support, because what my amendment does is it would close an oil and gas industry loophole to the Clean Air Act's aggregation requirement, which I will be talking more about today.

Currently, under current law, the oil and gas industry doesn't have to aggregate its small air pollution sources, even though cumulatively they release large amounts of air pollutants. Again, what that means in a district like mine where there are many fracking pads, there is, of course, an emission profile to each of these, but because they are small sites, they are not aggregated. We happen to have a county, Weld County, Colorado, with over 20,000 operating wells. When you get up to that kind of number, you can no longer round down to zero. In the aggregate, those wells look a lot more like a number of large, industrial plants that otherwise would fall under the Clean Air Act than simply small sites that can be rounded down to zero.

I couldn't be more excited to have the opportunity to finally bring up my amendment and hopefully adopt it so we can improve the Clean Air Act instead of many of the other provisions of the bill which would eviscerate the Clean Air Act.

This is a serious issue. Between 1980 and 2014, emissions of six air pollutants controlled by the Clean Air Act have dropped by 63 percent. That is good news. We should be doing more, not less, to encourage clean air with the long-term savings of the health of the American people as well as a reduction of costly diseases like asthma.

A recent peer-reviewed study estimates that the Clean Air Act will save more than 230,000 lives and will prevent millions of cases of respiratory problems. But instead of strengthening that act, the provisions of the bill will delay the implementation of the updated 2015 Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards by States, a position that is opposed by a broad coalition of scientists and many other groups that care about public health.

The connection between air quality and asthma, of which our country has 25 million sufferers, is well established. Clean air is integral to quality of life, and the last thing we should do is tear down the protections that allow kids to play outside, and that allow adults to recreate outside and enjoy themselves while continuing to breathe clean air.

Again, I am not worried about this bill becoming law. It won't pass the Senate, and, obviously, since it undoes some of President Obama's actions somehow were it to reach his desk, I am confident that it would be vetoed.

The problems go on and on with this bill. I do hope that my amendment passes. It is the first opportunity that I have had to bring forward my BREATHE Act, which has over 50 cosponsors to actually bring it forward

for a vote and a discussion. We haven't been able to get that floor time until now.

So, all in all, I think this is an encouraging week. On the one hand, we finally get to discuss a carbon tax cut—how exciting—and also, we finally realize that people are actually worried enough about this happening that they are running some kind of proactive strategy to try to lock people down. Wow. This is happening. We are going to have a carbon tax cut sometime in the next few years. This is great.

Second, I finally get the BREATHE Act, for it is an amendment to close a loophole for oil and gas in the Clean Air Act. Again, I don't expect that to pass. I hope to have good support, and, of course, I call upon my friends to reject the underlying bills.

Instead of continuing the climate-denying work of the majority that these three bills kind of double down on, we should be focusing on creating jobs, tax reform, which, again, a carbon tax cut would allow us a foray into cutting taxes for corporations, cutting taxes for individuals. And yet again, instead of focusing on the needs of middle class Americans, instead of focusing on shrinking the deficit, instead of focusing on reducing subsidies for oil and gas companies, we are furthering our reliance on legacy, dirty energy systems to power what we hope is an economy of the future. It is the wrong way to go.

I encourage Members to look in the mirror, think about the health of themselves, of their children, of their parents, the elderly, and those most at risk and ask about how those bills would impact them. The answer is obvious, and I think that, hopefully, the answer that this body gives to these bills will also be obvious.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up legislation that fully funds the administration's effort to mount a robust and long-term response to the growing Zika crisis.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment in the RECORD along with extraneous material immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' and defeat the previous question so we can focus this body on Zika and the public health risk to the American people, to vote ''no'' on the rule, to vote ''no'' on the underlying bills, but, frankly, to move forward with the door having been opened for this discussion and this coalition between left and right on a carbon tax cut proposal. Let's take advantage of that door being opened a crack, and let this be the start of something really great and the start of something really special that can help launch the next decade and more of stronger, pro-growth economic policies letting American families keep more of their hard-earned income and encouraging American companies to stay put rather than move overseas.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, when you turn on the television, when you open up a newspaper here in the election season, it seems like folks are pretty angry. I enjoy coming down to the floor on rules to work with my friend from Colorado because I genuinely enjoy him. If we are going to get anything done across the aisle, I have no doubt that he is going to be a part of that solution. As you listen to his words down here today, you heard that. Time and time again, there are things we can do together, there are ways we can be better together. Let's find some commonsense alternatives.

Sadly, in an election year like this, oftentimes that is as far as the conversation goes. If you can't fit it on a bumper sticker, you don't have that conversation. You heard the gentleman say—for example, with respect to my own tax bill, H.R. 25, the FairTax, the most widely cosponsored fundamental tax reform bill in the entire United States Congress, he had favorable things to say. But if you look at any Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee-run advertisement, they skewer the men and women who take a chance on growing the economy with the FairTax. They skewer the men and women who take a chance on repealing the taxes, the most burdensome tax on the 80 percent of American working families who have to pay it. In the name of politics, folks don't get past the bumper sticker to the real substance.

I listen to my friend from Colorado. He gives me hope. He gives me hope that we are going to be able to get over that line, Mr. Speaker. But the truth is, we have to get past the bumper sticker slogan. My friend from Colorado is going to be part of whatever fundamental tax reform change is made here. But we ought to be able to agree that just adding more taxes to an already broken system—as the President proposes—can't possibly be the right answer.

My friend is absolutely right that we need to fund American infrastructure, and I would argue the user-fee system is the way to do it. Not repatriation, which takes completely unconnected dollars, but user fees which say that, if you are on the roads, you should pay for the roads. But that is a discussion we will have to have.

□ 1330

This is the right place to have that discussion. We will have that discussion, and I hope that we will come to a conclusion.

My friend says that job creation is job one, but supports complete re-regulation of industries which is destroying jobs across this country. I will give you an example, Mr. Speaker, and it is what is so frustrating to folks back home.

Again, Prime Minister Modi stood where you are standing. He spoke for 1.3 billion people. I only speak for about 700,000. But those 700,000 open up the newspaper when they get into their office on a Monday morning, trying to comply with the National Ambient Air Quality Standards, the ozone standards.

Those standards, released in 2008, finally got around to having the regulations for how to comply with them finalized in March of 2015. I will say that again. This crisis of human health that my friend has described, we identified in 2008, and the administration got around to telling folks what the rules were by March of 2015.

So all the job creators across the country began to scramble to comply with those rules, Mr. Speaker. And then in October of 2015, the administration says: Oh, no, wait. We have a much better idea. Now let's do ozone compliance, part two.

In 2008, we decided we had an issue we wanted to address. In March of 2015, the administration finally got around to addressing it. As soon as folks began to spend the money and the intellectual effort to comply with those rules, by October of that same year, the administration says: Oh, no. We have got a better idea. Scrap that.

When my friend reads from all of the conservative economists, the libertarian economists, the folks who care about making sure our limited resources do the most good for the American people and those folks support a carbon tax, they don't support a carbon tax in addition to the nonsensical regulatory structure that I have just described. They support a carbon tax instead of that structure.

If we monetize harms in this country, we don't have to have a bureaucracy that guesses at what the issues are; we don't have to have a bureaucracy that moves not in a day or a week or a month, but takes years, almost decades, to move in the marketplace. We move quickly, and we maximize. For every dollar that compliance costs, for every dollar that environmental stewardship costs, for every dollar that NG exploration costs, we get the maximum return for every American family.

I think there is a pathway there. I think there is a pathway there. But understand, more of the same won't get us there. The power to tax is the power to destroy. Stop destroying job creation. The power to tax is the power to destroy. Stop destroying American corporations and moving them overseas.

Golly, we have got opportunity to come together. I believe these three provisions before us, Mr. Speaker, are going to move us in that direction.

Make no mistake; our ozone bill that we have before us today makes every amendment from this body in order—

save one that was virtually exactly the same as another, and we didn't want to be duplicative here of the Members' time—made every discussion in order, including the one from the gentleman from Colorado.

The sense of Congress today says we don't need to tax fossil fuels as an answer to anything, that taxes are just taxes; and in the absence of a coherent environmental policy, in the absence of a coherent stewardship policy, in the absence of men and women on the ground who are balancing the needs of jobs and the needs of community, it is just a bumper sticker slogan.

Let's reject bumper sticker slogans today. Let's take advantage of the serious men and women that serve in this institution, like the gentleman from Colorado. Let's get together and do the heavy lifting.

Mr. Speaker, if it were easy, they would have done it already. The reason you are here, the reason my friend from Colorado is here, and the reason I am here is not to do the easy things; it is to do the hard things.

What I have come to know in my 5½ years in this institution is I have not met a man or a woman who is serious about making a difference for the country who wouldn't take their voting card and turn it in tomorrow if they could make that kind of lasting difference that would serve not just this generation, but generations to come. We have that opportunity, Mr. Speaker. It is an election year, but let's not squander it. We can make these next 8 months count for the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I urge strong support for the rule. I urge support for the underlying resolutions as well, but I urge strong support for the rule that will begin this discussion.

The material previously referred to by Mr. POLIS is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 767 OFFERED BY MR. POLIS

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

SEC. 4. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5044) making supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 2016 to respond to Zika virus. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided among and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations and the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 5. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 5044.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308–311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as ''a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge.'' To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that ''the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition'' in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R–Illinois) said: ''The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition.''

The Republican majority may say ''the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever.'' But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: ''Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule. . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment.''

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled ''Amending Special Rules'' states: ''a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate.'' (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: ''Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon.''

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. WOODALL. I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adoption of the resolution, if ordered; the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 3826; and agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 230, nays 163, not voting 40, as follows:

[Roll No. 273]

YEAS—230

Abraham	Fleischmann	Latta
Aderholt	Fleming	LoBiondo
Allen	Flores	Long
Amash	Forbes	Loudermilk
Amodei	Fortenberry	Love
Babin	Foxx	Lucas
Barletta	Franks (AZ)	Luetkemeyer
Barr	Frelinghuysen	Lummis
Barton	Garrett	MacArthur
Benishek	Gibbs	Marchant
Bilirakis	Gibson	Marino
Bishop (MI)	Gohmert	Massie
Bishop (UT)	Goodlatte	McCaul
Blackburn	Gosar	McClintock
Blum	Gowdy	McHenry
Bost	Granger	McKinley
Boustany	Graves (GA)	McMorris Rodgers
Brady (TX)	Graves (LA)	McSally
Brat	Graves (MO)	Meadows
Bridenstine	Griffith	Meehan
Brooks (AL)	Grothman	Messer
Brooks (IN)	Guinta	Mica
Buchanan	Guthrie	Miller (MI)
Buck	Hanna	Moolenaar
Bucshon	Harper	Mooney (WV)
Burgess	Harris	Mullin
Byrne	Hartzler	Mulvaney
Calvert	Heck (NV)	Murphy (PA)
Carter (GA)	Hensarling	Neugebauer
Carter (TX)	Hice, Jody B.	Newhouse
Chabot	Hill	Noem
Chaffetz	Holding	Nugent
Clawson (FL)	Hudson	Nunes
Coffman	Huelskamp	Olson
Cole	Huizenga (MI)	Palazzo
Collins (GA)	Hultgren	Palmer
Collins (NY)	Hurd (TX)	Paulsen
Comstock	Issa	Pearce
Conaway	Jenkins (KS)	Perry
Cook	Jenkins (WV)	Pittenger
Costello (PA)	Johnson (OH)	Pitts
Cramer	Johnson, Sam	Poe (TX)
Crawford	Jolly	Poliquin
Crenshaw	Jones	Posey
Culberson	Jordan	Price, Tom
Curbelo (FL)	Joyce	Ratcliffe
Davis, Rodney	Katko	Reed
Denham	Kelly (MS)	Reichert
Dent	Kelly (PA)	Renacci
DeSantis	King (IA)	Ribble
DesJarlais	King (NY)	Rice (SC)
Diaz-Balart	Kinzinger (IL)	Rigell
Dold	Kline	Roby
Donovan	Knight	Roe (TN)
Duncan (SC)	Labrador	Rogers (AL)
Duncan (TN)	LaHood	Rogers (KY)
Emmer (MN)	LaMalfa	Rohrabacher
Farenthold	Lamborn	Rokita
Fitzpatrick	Lance	

Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Russell
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NAYS—163

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Eshoo
Esty
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Israel
Jackson Lee
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pascrell
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—40

Black
Cárdenas
Cummings
Deutch
Duffy
Ellison
Ellmers (NC)
Engel
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hardy
Herrera Beutler
Huffman
Hunter
Hurt (VA)
Jeffries
Lee
Lieu, Ted
McCarthy
Miller (FL)
Nadler
Pallone
Payne
Pompeo
Rooney (FL)
Royce
Rush
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Scott, David
Sires
Smith (NJ)
Takai
Walters, Mimi
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine

□ 1357

Mr. COOPER changed his vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. RIGELL changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 273, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

Mr. HURT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I was not present for rollcall vote No. 273 on Ordering the Previous Question on H. Res. 767, Providing for consideration of H.R. 4775, the Ozone Standards Implementation Act of 2016; providing for consideration of H. Con. Res. 89, expressing the sense of Congress that a carbon tax would be detrimental to the United States economy; and providing for consideration of H. Con. Res. 112. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 235, noes 163, not voting 35, as follows:

[Roll No. 274]

AYES—235

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOES—163

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Israel
Jackson Lee
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—35

Black
Cárdenas
Conyers
Cummings
Duffy
Ellison
Ellmers (NC)
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hardy
Herrera Beutler
Huffman
Hunter
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Lee
Lieu, Ted
Luetkemeyer
McCarthy
Nadler
Payne
Pittenger
Rush
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sires
Takai
Walters, Mimi
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine

□ 1403

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 274.

MOUNT HOOD COOPER SPUR LAND EXCHANGE CLARIFICATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3826) to amend the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009 to modify provisions relating to certain land exchanges in the Mt. Hood Wilderness in the State of Oregon, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HARDY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 401, nays 2, not voting 30, as follows:

[Roll No. 275]

YEAS—401

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bera
Beyer
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blum
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bost
Boustany
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Capps
Capuano
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clawson (FL)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donovan
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Emmer (MN)
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graham
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Honda
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Kuster
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matsui
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Moulton
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Pascrell
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (NC)
Price, Tom
Quigley
Rangel
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Russell
Ryan (OH)
Salmon
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Trott
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walz
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NAYS—2

Amash
Griffith

NOT VOTING—30

Black
Cárdenas
Cummings
Duffy
Ellison
Ellmers (NC)
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hardy
Herrera Beutler
Huffman
Hunter
Jeffries
Kennedy
Lee
Lieu, Ted
McCarthy
Nadler
Payne
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sires
Takai
Walters, Mimi
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia) (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1411

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ changed her vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent in the House chamber for votes on Wednesday, June 8, 2016. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall votes 273 and 274, and "yea" on rollcall vote 275.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Brian Pate, one of his secretaries.

□ 1415

OZONE STANDARDS IMPLEMENTATION ACT OF 2016

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the bill, H.R. 4775.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NEWHOUSE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 767 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 4775.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JODY B. HICE) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1415

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4775) to

facilitate efficient State implementation of ground-level ozone standards, and for other purposes, with Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD).

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON), the chairman of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chairman, jobs, the economy, and public health all are very critical priorities for the American people. It is possible, in fact, to pursue policies that simultaneously protect all three of them. Today we have a balanced approach in the Ozone Standards Implementation Act, and it does exactly that.

Addressing ozone levels has been one of the major successes of the 1970 Clean Air Act. Across the country, ozone levels, in fact, have declined dramatically, having declined nearly one-third since 1980. The EPA's 2008 ozone standard would have continued that success by setting out a program to achieve further reductions for many years to come.

But the EPA failed to finalize the implementing regs and guidance for the 2008 rule until just last year, and as a result, States are currently still in the process of implementing the rule. Although EPA had difficulty finalizing the 2008 regs, the Agency had no such problems coming up with a new ozone standard so unworkable for certain areas of the country that even the Agency itself concedes the technologies to fully implement and to comply still don't exist. And now, States are stuck with the impossible task of applying both standards concurrently.

In my district in southwest Michigan, in Allegan County, you could, in fact, remove every piece of human activity—roads, barbecues, jobs, move everybody out—and the region still would be in nonattainment because of the ozone that is generated from Chicago, Milwaukee, and Gary, Indiana. The new standard would result in potentially hundreds of counties across the Midwest—certainly a good number of them in Michigan—that would be designated as nonattainment, resulting in fewer new businesses or expansions of existing ones, and even fewer major construction and other infrastructure projects.

The threat of future nonattainment designation has a chilling effect and encourages employers to move someplace else, even out of the United States to relocate abroad. So it is essentially often a kiss of death for economic growth, and it comes at a time when our fragile economy can least afford it.

This thoughtful solution, this bill, retains the 2008 standard—yes, it does—but it provides additional time for States to comply with the new standard until after the current one has been fully implemented. It is common sense. Under this bill, we will have in place a more streamlined and effective schedule to ensure continued improvements in air quality in the years ahead.

The bill also has a number of sensible provisions to address practical implementation challenges that States face under the National Ambient Air Quality Standards program. It extends the mandatory review process from 5 years to a more workable 10, while allowing the EPA Administrator the discretion to review and revise standards earlier if circumstances warrant. It requires that EPA's implementing regs and guidance come out along with a new standard so that States and affected entities will have the direction that they need to comply.

The good news is, under this bill, ozone levels continue their long-term downward trend, and we can accomplish that goal without jeopardizing jobs.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, here we go again. We should be addressing our failing infrastructure, funding the National Institutes of Health or the Centers for Disease Control to control Zika, helping the people of Flint who were exposed to lead in the drinking water, investing in clean energy, mitigating the risks of climate change, and fulfilling our constitutional responsibility to fund our government. Instead of attending to the many important challenges we face, we are here to consider yet another bill that will undermine our Clean Air Act.

Consideration of this bill is a waste of time. No wonder people across the country are frustrated and disappointed with Washington. We are not doing the things that will create opportunities to inspire our young people and fully employ everyone who wants and needs to work. Instead of doing something to improve public health and our environment, we are trying to undermine those dynamics.

H.R. 4775 is a bill that will do nothing to further improve our air quality. It offers no assistance to State and local governments. It offers no assistance to businesses that want to do the right thing and find ways to improve our environmental and social performance of their operations.

This bill creates new loopholes through which polluters will add toxic substances to our air and erode the substantial gains we have made in public health under the Clean Air Act.

H.R. 4775 has taken many approaches to undermining the Clean Air Act: it doubles the NAAQS review cycle from 5 to 10 years, which will prevent standards from being set using the most up-to-date science; it delays the implementation of the 2015 ozone NAAQS up to 8 years; and it alters the criteria for establishing a NAAQS from one based solely on protecting public health to one that would include considerations of affordability and current technical feasibility. These are just a few among many harmful changes in this bill.

That is why this bill has inspired such opposition. We have received letters of opposition signed by more than 130 environmental and public health organizations as well as a veto threat from the President's administration.

There is nothing new here. Once again, we hear the false choice presented: jobs or clean air. But that is not the choice, and we have decades of experience with local and Federal policy to regulate air pollution as proof that we do not have to choose between being employed and being healthy.

This false choice is even more absurd when you consider that there is one choice we must make every day about 20,000 times to stay alive: the choice to breathe. That is the average number of breaths that each adult takes every day of his or her life. Children, whose lungs are smaller average more breaths than that; and if you are exercising, that number will understandably be higher as well. That is a lot of exposure. So it is vitally important that the air we take in some 20,000 times per day is as clean as possible.

Ozone is extremely harmful. We have known this for about 70 years. We did not know the precise chemical nature of ozone back in 1947 when the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors established the Nation's first air pollution control program. Back then it was called smog. In the middle of a heat wave, the smog that formed over L.A. caused people's eyes to burn and a scraping sensation in their throats. It literally became painful to breathe.

Although Los Angeles has long been recognized as a location with special challenges in air pollution due to geography and prevailing weather patterns, it is not the only city that experienced these problems. They were reported in other industrial cities as well.

We have come a long way since that time, but we did not clean up the air significantly until we created an enforceable regulatory structure that applied a set of standards to both businesses and individuals.

H.R. 4775 undermines the single most important criteria in the Clean Air Act: the mandate to set a standard that will allow every one of our citizens, no matter their age or location, to take 20,000 breaths of clean, safe air every day. We can certainly afford clean air. In fact, we must afford clean air. We have demonstrated time and time again that we can develop and deploy technologies that will achieve those ends.

H.R. 4775 is a dangerous and unnecessary bill, and I oppose the bill. I urge my colleagues to reject this latest assault on public health and to support the further improvements of air quality for our constituents.

Mr. Chair, I include in the RECORD, for the sake of this dialogue, the over 130 letters of opposition we have received.

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

MAY 10, 2016.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: Clean air is fundamental for good health, and the Clean Air Act promises all Americans air that is safe to breathe. The undersigned public health and medical organizations urge you to oppose H.R. 4775, the so-called ''Ozone Standards Implementation Act of 2016.'' Despite the clear scientific evidence of the need for greater protection from ozone pollution, and the Clean Air Act's balanced implementation timeline that provides states clear authority and plenty of time to plan and then work to reduce pollution to meet the updated standard, H.R. 4775 imposes additional delays and sweeping changes that will threaten health, particularly the health of children, seniors and people with chronic disease.

In contrast to what the bill's title implies, H.R. 4775 reaches far beyond implementation of the current ozone standards. It also permanently weakens the Clean Air Act and future air pollution health standards for all criteria pollutants. Specifically, H.R. 4775 weakens implementation and enforcement of all lifesaving air pollution health standards including those for carbon monoxide, lead, nitrogen dioxide, ozone, particulate matter, and sulfur dioxide. It would also permanently undermine the Clean Air Act as a public health law.

The Clean Air Act requires that the Environmental Protection Agency review the science on the health impacts of carbon monoxide, lead, nitrogen dioxide, ozone, particulate matter, and sulfur dioxide air pollutants every five years and update these national ambient air quality standards according to the current science. H.R. 4775 would lengthen the review period of the air pollution health standards from once every five years to once every ten years for all criteria pollutants. As the science continues to evolve, EPA and states should have the best and most current data inform air pollution cleanup.

New research shows additional impacts that air pollution has on human health. For example, on March 29, 2016, a new study, Particulate Matter Exposure and Preterm Birth: Estimates of U.S. Attributable Burden and Economic Costs, was published that shows particulate air pollution is linked to nearly 16,000 preterm births per year. Under H.R. 4775, EPA would have to wait as much as a decade to consider new evidence when setting standards. Ten years is far too long to wait to protect public health from levels of pollution that the science shows are dangerous or for EPA to consider new information.

In the 2015 review of the ozone standard, EPA examined an extensive body of scientific evidence demonstrating that ozone inflames the lungs, causing asthma attacks, resulting in emergency room visits, hospitalizations, and premature deaths. A growing body of research indicates that ozone may also lead to central nervous system harm and may harm developing fetuses. In response to the evidence, EPA updated the ozone standards. While many of our organizations called for a more protective level, there is no doubt that the new 70 parts per billion standard provides greater health protections compared to the previous standard.

H.R. 4775 would delay implementation of these more protective air pollution standards for at least eight years. This means eight years of illnesses and premature deaths that could have been avoided. Parents will not be told the truth about pollution in their community and states and EPA will not work to curb pollution to meet the new standards. The public has a fundamental right to know when pollution in the air they breathe or the water they drink threatens health, and Congress must not add eight years of delay to health protections and cleanup.

H.R. 4775 would also permanently weaken implementation of the 2015 and future ozone standards. It would reduce requirements for areas with the most dangerous levels of ozone. Areas classified as being in ''extreme nonattainment'' of the standard would no longer need to build plans that include additional contingency measures if their initial plans fail to provide the expected pollution reductions. The Clean Air Act prioritizes reducing air pollution to protect the public's health, but H.R. 4775 opens a new opportunity for communities to avoid cleaning up, irrespective of the health impacts.

Further, the bill would greatly expand the definition of an exceptional event. Under the Clean Air Act, communities can demonstrate to EPA that an exceptional event—such as a wildfire—should not ''count'' in determining whether their air quality meets the national standards. This bill would recklessly expand the definition of exceptional events to include high pollution days when the air is simply stagnant—the precise air pollution episodes the Clean Air Act was designed to combat—and declare those bad air days as ''exceptional.'' Changing the accounting rules will undermine health protection and avoid pollution cleanup.

Additionally, the bill would permanently weaken the Clean Air Act. The Clean Air Act is one of our nation's premier public health laws because it puts health first. The Act has a two-step process: first, EPA considers scientific evidence to decide how much air pollution is safe to breathe and sets the standard that is requisite to protect public health with an adequate margin of safety. Then, states work with EPA to develop a plan to clean up air pollution to meet the standard. Cost and feasibility are fully considered in the second phase during implementation of the standard.

This bill states that if EPA finds that ''a range of levels'' of an air pollutant protect public health with an adequate margin of safety, then EPA may consider technological feasibility in choosing a limit within that range. Further, the bill would interject implementation considerations including adverse economic and energy effects into the standard setting process. These changes will permanently weaken the core health-based premise of the Clean Air Act—protecting the public from known health effects of air pollution with a margin of safety.

H.R. 4775 is a sweeping attack on lifesaving standards that protect public health from air pollution. This bill is an extreme attempt to undermine our nation's clean air health protections. Not only does it delay the long-overdue updated ozone standards and weaken their implementation and enforcement, it also permanently weakens the health protections against many dangerous air pollutants and the scientific basis of Clean Air Act standards.

Please prioritize the health of your constituents and vote NO on H.R. 4775.

Sincerely,

Allergy & Asthma Network, Alliance of Nurses for Healthy Environments, American Academy of Pediatrics, American College of Preventive Medicine, American Lung Association, American Public Health Association, American Thoracic Society, Asthma and Allergy Foundation of America, Children's Environmental Health Network, Health Care Without Harm, March of Dimes, National Association of County & City Health Officials, National Environmental Health Association, Physicians for Social Responsibility, Public Health Institute, Trust for America's Health.

LEAGUE OF CONSERVATION VOTERS,
Washington, DC, June 7, 2016.

Re: Oppose H.R. 4775—Extreme Attack on Smog Protections & the Clean Air Act.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of our millions of members, the League of Conservation Voters (LCV) works to turn environmental values into national priorities. Each year, LCV publishes the National Environmental Scorecard, which details the voting records of members of Congress on environmental legislation. The Scorecard is distributed to LCV members, concerned voters nationwide, and the media.

LCV urges you to vote NO on H.R. 4775, the ''Ozone Standards Implementation Act,'' a radical bill that jeopardizes the health of the American people by undermining the EPA's recently-updated standards for ozone pollution (a.k.a. smog) and eviscerating a central pillar of the Clean Air Act.

The Clean Air Act was enacted with strong bipartisan support and is based on the central premise that clean air protections for dangerous pollutants like smog, soot, carbon monoxide, sulfur dioxide and lead be based solely on the best-available health science. The law's drafters structured the law in this manner because Americans deserve to know if their air is safe to breathe or not. For the first time ever, H.R. 4775 would allow the EPA to consider factors unrelated to health, like technical feasibility in the initial standard setting process. States consider feasibility and cost when they implement the standards. This system has worked extremely well since 1970 as air quality has improved dramatically while the economy has grown.

The bill would also gut EPA's ozone standards, which were updated last fall. H.R. 4775 would delay these vital health protections by at least ten years and double the law's current five-year review periods for updating ozone and all national air quality standards allowing unhealthy air to persist even longer. High ozone levels pose a significant threat to our health, and are especially dangerous for children, the elderly, and asthmatics.

We urge you to REJECT H.R. 4775 and will strongly consider including votes on this bill in the 2016 Scorecard. If you need more information, please call my office and ask to speak with a member of our Government Relations team.

Sincerely,

GENE KARPINSKI,
President.

JUNE 7, 2016.

DEAR SENATOR/REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of our millions of members, the undersigned 118 organizations urge you to oppose the ''Ozone Standards Implementation Act'' (H.R. 4775, S. 2882). The innocuous-sounding name is misleading: this legislation would actually systematically weaken the Clean Air Act without a single improvement, undermine Americans' 46-year right to healthy air based on medical science, and delay lifesaving health standards already years overdue.

This bill's vision of ''Ozone Standards Implementation'' eliminates health benefits and the right to truly safe air that Americans enjoy under today's law. First, the legislation would delay for ten years the right

to safer air quality, and even the simple right to know if the air is safe to breathe. Corporations applying for air pollution permits would be free to ignore new ground-level ozone (aka smog) health standards during these additional ten years. For the first time the largest sources of air pollution would be allowed to exceed health standards. The bill would also outright excuse the parts of the country suffering the worst smog pollution from having backup plans if they do not reduce pollution. The most polluted parts of the country should not stop doing everything they can to protect their citizens' health and environment by cleaning up smog pollution.

This bill is not content to merely weaken and delay reductions in smog pollution. It also strikes at our core right to clean air based on health and medical science. The medically-based health standards that the law has been founded on for 46 years instead could become a political football weakened by polluter compliance costs. This could well result in communities being exposed to unhealthy levels of smog and soot and sulfur dioxide and even toxic lead pollution. The bill would also double the law's five-year review periods for recognizing the latest science and updating health standards, which are already frequently years late; this means in practice that unhealthy air would persist for longer than ten years.

The legislation also weakens implementation of current clean air health standards. The bill expands exemptions for ''exceptional events'' that are not counted towards compliance with health standards for air quality, even when air pollution levels are unsafe. This will mean more unsafe air more often, with no responsibility to clean it up. Requirements meant to ensure progress toward reducing smog and soot pollution would shift from focusing on public health and achievability to economic costs. Despite the bland name ''Ozone Standards Implementation Act,'' this bill represents an extreme attack on the most fundamental safeguards and rights in the Clean Air Act.

Since 1970, the Federal Clean Air Act has been organized around one governing principle—that the EPA must set health standards based on medical science for dangerous air pollution, including smog, soot and lead, that protect all Americans, with ''an adequate margin of safety'' for vulnerable populations like children, the elderly and asthmatics. This legislation eviscerates that principle and protection. We urge you to oppose H.R. 4775 and S. 2882, to protect our families and Americans' rights to clean air.

Sincerely,

350KC; 350 Loudoun; Alaska Community Action on Toxics; Alton Area Cluster UCM (United Congregations of Metro-East); Brentwood House California Latino Business Institute; Center for Biological Diversity; Chesapeake Physicians for Social Responsibility; Chicago Physicians for Social Responsibility; Citizens for Clean Air; Clean Air Watch; Clean Water Action; Cleveland Environmental Action Network; Climate Action Alliance of the Valley; Connecticut League of Conservation Voters; Conservation Voters for Idaho; Conservation Voters of South Carolina; Dakota Resource Council; Earth Day Network; Earthjustice.

Earthworks; Environment Iowa; Environment America; Environment Arizona; Environment California; Environment Colorado; Environment Connecticut; Environment Florida; Environment Georgia; Environment Illinois; Environment Maine; Environment Maryland; Environment Massachusetts; Environment Michigan; Environment Minnesota; Environment Missouri; Environment Montana; Environment Nevada; Environment New Hampshire; Environment New Jersey.

Environment New Mexico; Environment North Carolina; Environment Ohio; Environment Oregon; Environment Rhode Island; Environment Texas; Environment Virginia; Environment Washington; Environmental Defense Action Fund; Environmental Entrepreneurs (E2); Environmental Law & Policy Center; Ethical Society of St. Louis; Faith Alliance for Climate Solutions; Florida Conservation Voters; Fort Collins Sustainability Group; GreenLatinos; Health Care Without Harm; Iowa Interfaith Power & Light; Jean-Michel Cousteau's Ocean Futures Society; KyotoUSA.

Labadie Environmental Organization (LEO); Latino Donor Collaborative; League of Conservation Voters; League of Women Voters; Maine Conservation Voters; Maryland League of Conservation Voters; Michigan League of Conservation Voters; Moms Clean Air Force; Montana Conservation Voters Education Fund; Montana Environmental Information Center; National Parks Conservation Association; Natural Resources Defense Council; NC League of Conservation Voters; Nevada Conservation League; New Mexico Environmental Law Center; New York League of Conservation Voters; Northern Plains Resource Council; OEC Action Fund; Ohio Organizing Collaborative, Communities United for Responsible Energy; Oregon League of Conservation Voters.

Partnership for Policy Integrity; PennEnvironment; People Demanding Action, Tucson Chapter; Physicians for Social Responsibility; Physicians for Social Responsibility, Maine Chapter; Physicians for Social Responsibility, Los Angeles Chapter; Physicians for Social Responsibility, Arizona Chapter; Physicians for Social Responsibility, SF Bay Area Chapter; Physicians for Social Responsibility, Tennessee Chapter; Physicians for Social Responsibility, Wisconsin Chapter; Powder River Basin Resource Council; Public Citizen; Public Citizen's Texas Office; RVA Interfaith Climate Justice Team; Safe Climate Campaign; San Juan Citizens Alliance; Sierra Club; Southern Environmental Law Center; Sustainable Energy & Economic Development (SEED) Coalition; Texas Campaign for the Environment.

Texas Environmental Justice Advocacy Services; Texas League of Conservation Voters; The Environmental Justice Center at Chestnut Hills United Church; Trust for America's Health; Union of Concerned Scientists; Utah Physicians for a Healthy Environment; Valley Watch; Virginia Organizing; Virginia Interfaith Power & Light; Voces Verdes; Voices for Progress; Washington Conservation Voters; Western Colorado Congress; Western Organization of Resource Councils; Wisconsin Environmental Health Network; Wisconsin League of Conservation Voters; Wisconsin Environment; Wyoming Outdoor Council.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. OLSON), the vice chairman of the Subcommittee on Energy and Power.

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Chairman, every time I talk about this bipartisan bill, I make sure to emphasize one point: I want clean air.

I remember Houston in the 1970s. We could not see the downtown through the smog. We have made a lot of progress since then. The whole country has made a lot of progress since then. I want that progress to continue.

Despite what some would have you believe, Mr. Chairman, this bipartisan bill is not about fundamentally changing the Clean Air Act. Nothing in this bipartisan bill changes any air quality standard or regulation. Nothing in this bipartisan bill puts cost before science when EPA sets a new standard.

This bipartisan bill is about carefully thought-out, commonsense reforms. It is about listening to State regulators who actually had to make EPA's rules work for the people.

The people I work for back home are full of common sense. Common sense says that EPA should put out guidance to follow a new rule at the same time they put out the rule.

Folks in Texas 22 and across America are puzzled. What is wrong with EPA putting out a complete package of rules and regulations together instead of a rule first followed by regulations 7 years later? That is not common sense. That is a road to failure, a road we are going down right now.

As Dr. Bryan Shaw, the top regulator for air quality in my home State of Texas, said, provisions in this bipartisan bill will ''allow States to focus their limited resources'' to implement EPA's previous ozone rule. We can continue to improve Texas air—and the air of every State—if we let our regulators do their jobs.

I carefully wrote this bipartisan bill to include more common sense. Let EPA consider achievability when issuing a new rule. This is not a mandate.

□ 1430

I ask my opponents to read this bipartisan bill. Read the language. It clearly says the EPA may consider achievability when they set a new standard. This provision will never allow EPA to set an unhealthy standard. They can't use cost to ignore science.

Let's bring common sense to the EPA and work together to help States improve air quality. Vote for this bill.

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR).

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his leadership on energy and clean air policy for all of America.

Mr. Chair, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 4775. The Republican bill is a radical attempt to gut the Clean Air Act.

The Clean Air Act has been one of our bedrock environmental laws for America since the 1970s. So for 50 years it has worked well to ensure that it protects our health while businesses thrive. It has made such a difference in our lives.

I heard my good friend from Houston say he has seen the air cleaned up. The same is true in the Sunshine State of Florida. I remember those smoggy days in the late sixties and early seventies. I watched the impact of the Clean Air Act make it healthier for us to breathe, to grow up, to live healthy lives. All you have to do is look across the globe at China and India and the struggles they have with their economy because they are not able to control their pollution.

The great thing about the Clean Air Act is that it is based on science. It requires the EPA every 5 years to bring scientists together and do a health check, do a check on the air quality standards all across America. Then they can—they are not required to—say: we are going to improve the air quality standards. And then they leave it up to States and stakeholders at home to determine how best to control air pollution. It has been extraordinarily effective at cleaning the air.

EPA has set air quality standards for six different pollutants: ozone, nitrogen dioxide, sulfur dioxide, carbon monoxide, lead, and particulate matter. Between 1980 and 2014, emissions of these six air pollutants dropped by 63 percent. During the same period, the Nation's gross domestic product increased by 147 percent, vehicle miles traveled increased by 97 percent, energy consumption increased by 26 percent, and the U.S. population increased by 41 percent. These emissions reductions have generated dramatic health effects. There is a balance in the law already.

A recent peer-reviewed study says the Clean Air Act will save more than 230,000 lives and will prevent millions of cases of respiratory problems like asthma and other problems in 2020 alone. It will also enhance our national productivity by preventing 17 million lost workdays. These public health benefits translate into $2 trillion in monetized benefits to the economy.

Again, from the Sunshine State's perspective, we have a booming tourist economy largely because we have clean water and clear air. Everyone wants to come to Florida. They are very discerning with their tourist dollars and where they are going to take a vacation. They look across the world, and one of the reasons people travel to America or you travel to the Sunshine State is because it is healthy and clean; and it is largely because of the Clean Air Act that we have been able to do that.

So this bill is irresponsible because it will take us backwards. And let's talk a few specifics. The bill dramatically delays implementation of the 2015 ozone air quality standards by up to 8 years. It says to America: we are going to ignore the science, we are going to ignore the new standards that have been developed with thousands and thousands of comments, and we are going to ignore the fact that these improved standards will net benefits of up to $4.6 billion in 2025 alone.

Second, the bill doubles the air quality standard review period for all criteria air pollutants to every 10 years. Currently, the Clean Air Act says: EPA, every 5 years, look at the best science. Now, this bill says to ignore the science. Again, we will wait 10 years.

That is not smart and that is not helpful to our communities and our neighbors back home.

The bill also gives new and expanded facilities amnesty from new air quality standards. And this is where I think my Republican friends are going to invite a lot of litigation.

Before I came to Congress, I did a little bit of environmental law. Current existing industrial users and businesses will have to bear the burden because the new polluters will get a break—they will get amnesty—while our existing businesses will have to make up the difference. That is not smart, and I think that is going to create a lot of lawsuits.

Prime Minister Narendra Modi from India was here today. One of his messages, besides what a great democracy America is and what a great democracy India is, is that we have to think about the future. And we can tap the American ingenuity and what we have already done to clean air and grow business at the same time.

Other nations are realizing now what we have learned long ago: unregulated emission of dangerous air pollutants is unsustainable. The Clean Air Act has helped us make dramatic improvements in air quality over the past decades. Our economy has grown at the same time.

So I would urge my colleagues, do not gut the Clean Air Act. Vote ''no'' on H.R. 4775.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER).

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his efforts on this very important legislation.

Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of H.R. 4775, the Ozone Standards Implementation Act of 2016, so States will have the flexibility and tools to reasonably and effectively meet the new EPA ozone standards.

Since the proposal of EPA's 2008 ozone standards, States have continually worked to implement air quality standards to comply with EPA's clean air requirements. However, EPA's implementation regulations for the 2008 standards were not published until March 6, 2015, and then the revised ozone standards were issued in October of 2015.

States now face the prospect of simultaneously implementing two ozone standards at the same time. H.R. 4775 remedies this problem by creating a phase-in approach to the 2008 and 2015 ozone standards, extending the final designations under the 2015 standards to 2025.

It would also make reforms to the National Ambient Air Quality Standards to provide flexibility and structure to actions taken to implementing and revising these standards. States should be given the flexibility to implement air quality standards in a way that is cost effective and efficient.

I want to thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. OLSON) for introducing this bill. I also encourage my colleagues to support this legislation to ensure States are able to implement EPA ozone standards without harming their overall economy.

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, H.R. 4775 would fundamentally and permanently weaken the Clean Air Act as well as future air pollution health standards for all criteria pollutants.

Mr. Chair, H.R. 4775 would unacceptably delay implementation of the EPA's 2015 ozone standards for another 8 years, even though these standards haven't been updated since the Bush administration last did so in the year 2008.

Additionally, Mr. Chair, this bill would also mandate that the EPA wait a decade before considering any new evidence regarding the health implications from ozone and other harmful pollutants, despite what the science may say in the interval.

This drastic change to the Clean Air Act would prohibit the EPA from relying on the most current health-based scientific data when determining air pollutant standards.

Mr. Chair, H.R. 4775 would also fundamentally change provisions of the Clean Air Act by imposing cost and technological feasibility considerations on the standard-setting process, even though the Clean Air Act clearly states that only medical and public health data should be used when setting clean air health standards.

Mr. Chair, this radical change to the Nation's most historically important environmental law will lead to adverse consequences for both the public health and the resourcefulness of American companies and innovators.

As the EPA's Acting Assistant Administrator for the Office of Air and Radiation, Janet McCabe, noted in her recent testimony to the Energy and Power Subcommittee at a hearing entitled ''H.R. 4775, Ozone Standards Implementation Act'' just earlier this year in April: ''Despite repeated assertions that achieving clean air was just not feasible, American ingenuity has consistently risen to the challenge and made our country the leader in both clean air and clean air technology.

''That approach,'' she went on to say, ''has been very successful for both the health of Americans and our economy.''

Mr. Chair, what is missing in the arguments made by the majority against the Clean Air Act, as well as most other environmental protection laws, is the fact that these regulations have been extraordinarily beneficial not only to the American health, but also to the American economy.

In almost every instance, Mr. Chair, whenever a new environmental regulation has been proposed, we have heard opponents label them as job killers, overly burdensome, harmful to the economy, the end of the American way of life as we know it. In practically every instance, those dire predictions have been proven to be unequivocally wrong, as these laws, Mr. Chair, have served to protect the public health as

well as to spur new advances in technology and in services that we can then export overseas.

Mr. Chairman, undoubtedly, today's fight over the new ozone standard will follow this very same pattern. Instead of trying to stall the 2015 ozone standards and prohibit the EPA from regularly updating the National Ambient Air Quality Standards, as H.R. 4775 would do, we in this Congress should be heeding the warnings of doctors and scientists of not acting quickly enough to protect the public health.

□ 1445

Mr. Chairman, I strongly oppose this awful bill, and I urge all of my colleagues to do the same.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA), who is a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, a cosponsor of this legislation, and a gentleman focused on energy issues.

Mr. LATTA. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 4775, the Ozone Standards Implementation Act, of which I am a proud sponsor.

I would like to focus, in particular, on what this bill really does for the timeline of implementing ozone standards. H.R. 4775 focuses on efficient implementation of ozone and other air quality requirements by making commonsense adjustments to facilitate how air quality standards are implemented, based on practical experience.

Our legislation provides States with additional time to implement the 2015 standards which is needed to fully implement the 2008 ozone standards, since EPA only issued the implementing regulations in 2015.

Further, H.R. 4775 allows EPA time to develop the new implementing regulations and guidance needed for the 2015 standards, and also allows EPA to clear its existing backlog of hundreds of implementation plans relating to other existing standards.

Clean air remains our priority, and this legislation does not change the recent new ozone standard of 70 parts per billion. It does not change of the standards set by the agency for any other criteria pollutants.

Instead, it ensures that hundreds of counties are not unnecessarily subjected to additional regulatory burdens, paperwork requirements, and restrictions.

EPA projects that, based on 2012–2014 data, over 240 counties with ozone monitors would violate the 2015 standards, but they are already on track to meet those standards by 2025. It makes no sense to sweep these counties into unnecessarily burdensome ''nonattainment'' regulatory regimes.

EPA has estimated compliance costs for 2008 beginning in 2020 of $7.6 billion to $8.8 billion annually. On top of these costs, EPA estimates compliance costs for the 2015 standards beginning in 2025, of $2 billion annually, including $1.4 billion outside California, and $800 million in California.

However, EPA's own estimate may be too low, since they have admitted that in some places, most of or even all of the technology that will be needed to meet this rule has yet to be invented.

What this legislation postpones is the diversion of State resources from the most pressing challenges to meet a standard that EPA projects will be met anyway through measures already on the books.

Mr. Chairman, I urge support of H.R. 4775.

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, may I ask how much time is remaining on both sides?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Kentucky has 20 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Illinois has 13½ minutes remaining.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. FLORES), who is a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee and, I believe, a cosponsor of this legislation.

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Chairman, I thank Chairman WHITFIELD for allowing me to speak on behalf of this bill.

As a coauthor of H.R. 4775, I rise to strongly urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan Ozone Standards Implementation Act of 2016.

Since 1980, our economy has more than tripled in growth, while ozone levels have gone down by 33 percent. The EPA predicts that ozone levels will continue to improve, particularly as the 75 parts per billion standard is fully implemented.

Most importantly, the EPA states: ''The vast majority of U.S. counties will meet the 70 parts per billion standard by 2025 just with the rules and programs now in place or underway.''

In March of 2015, the EPA released its implementation regulations on the delayed 2008 ozone standard of 75 percent per billion. Last October, just 7 months later, the EPA moved the goal posts with a new ozone standard of 70 parts per billion.

Our States and communities now face the burden of spending scarce taxpayer resources to implement two different ozone standards at the same time.

So what does this mean? It means that even though the EPA admits that air quality will improve, our States and counties now face a premature nonattainment designation, significantly limiting new job creation opportunities.

Additional bureaucratic processes and unnecessary red tape will do nothing to protect public health; however, they will export jobs to countries like China with fewer regulations, while those countries send us their ozone emissions in return.

H.R. 4775 includes a key harmonization provision from H.R. 4000, the bipartisan legislation I introduced last November.

Section 2 of today's bill gives communities the needed time to meet the 70 parts per billion standard through 2025. It protects these areas from being subjected to unnecessary additional regulatory burdens and red tape, as these areas are already on track for compliance with both standards.

We have also heard from our State regulators that the current 5-year review cycle timeline for National Ambient Air Quality Standards is overly ambitious and not attainable. This is proven by the fact that, since 1971, the EPA has taken an average of 10½ years to review the standard for ozone, not 5, as is currently in effect.

Another provision I authored, section 3(a), modernizes the Clean Air Act by matching the mandatory review cycle with the actual timeline of previous EPA reviews; in other words, 10 years between reviews. This is a reasonable timeline in light of the Nation's dramatically improved air quality over the last three decades.

Protecting both public health and the economy are bipartisan goals we all share, and the two are not mutually exclusive.

I would like to thank Mr. OLSON, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. LATTA, Whip SCALISE, and Leader MCCARTHY for their work on this important issue. I would also like to thank Chairman UPTON and Chairman WHITFIELD for their efforts in shepherding this bill through the Energy and Commerce Committee.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support this commonsense bipartisan legislation.

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly disagree with my friend from Texas.

The proposed changes to the NAAQS review cycle would put lives at risk by permanently delaying updates to limits on not just ozone, but on every dangerous criteria air pollutant: carbon monoxide, lead, nitrogen oxides, ozone, particulate matter, and sulfur dioxide.

Mr. Chairman, the Clean Air Act requires the EPA to review the science every 5 years and to update the standards when necessary to protect the public health.

It is important to note that the EPA isn't required to update the NAAQS every 5 years, but to just review the science.

The 2015 ozone standard, Mr. Chairman, reflects strong scientific evidence regarding the harmful effects of ozone on human health and the environment; including more than 1,000 new studies.

Scientists, Mr. Chairman, are constantly researching the impacts that air pollution have on human health, and have consistently discovered that ozone, particle pollutants, and other types of air pollution covered by the Clean Air Act are, indeed, harmful in more ways and at lower concentration than previously understood.

Mr. Chairman, this bill would ignore all this scientific work and evidence by

doubling the review period from 5 years to 10 years, delaying the review of science and potentially necessary updates to the standard.

Mr. Chairman, 10 years is too long to wait to protect public health from levels of ozone, particle pollution, and other pollutants that the science shows are, indeed, very, very, very dangerous.

Delaying the EPA's review of the best medical science won't make outdated air pollution levels safe.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. HULTGREN). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself another 15 seconds.

Delaying EPA's review of the best medical science won't make outdated air pollution levels safe, it will just lead to more Americans suffering from unhealthy air for longer periods of time.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. WEBER).

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4775, the Ozone Standards Implementation Act, which I have cosponsored. I want to thank Congressman OLSON, my good friend and fellow Texan, for introducing this important legislation.

Last year, Mr. Chairman, the EPA finalized a costly new regulation to reduce ozone levels, even as States are only now beginning to implement the 2008 ozone standard. States will now have to deal with two regulations with overlapping implementation schedules. This is Federal bureaucracy at its finest, Mr. Chairman.

Now that the EPA is moving full steam ahead on its regulatory freight train, in order to get States back on track, Congress must act to give them certainty. H.R. 4775 will phase in implementation of those ozone standards over a reasonable timeline.

As ozone continues to fall to levels that reflect naturally occurring and even foreign-source ozone, we must also insist that the EPA report on how foreign pollution affects compliance with its overburdensome regulations. This legislation will do just that, Mr. Chairman.

There is no denying that the EPA's regulations will be costly for the States and costly, in turn, for our economy. The lower ozone levels are mandated, the harder it is for economic development to occur. That's just the way it is, as TED POE would say.

Communities across the country will be harmed, and low-income families, Mr. Chairman, are going to be harmed the most from this overburdensome regulation.

It is perfectly reasonable for Congress to insist that this regulatory boondoggle is reined in. I urge all Members to support this important legislation. It is the right thing to do. You know I am right.

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time is left?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois has 10¼ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Kentucky has 15 minutes remaining.

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to an extraordinary gentleman from the great State of New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE), our fine leader on the Democratic side.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the ranking member of our subcommittee for his kind remarks.

Once again, the House is considering a bill to undermine one of our most successful public health and environmental laws, the Clean Air Act. And clean air isn't a luxury, it is a necessity.

Before the Clean Air Act became law 43 years ago, thousands of Americans experienced the consequences of unhealthy air, respiratory disease, severe asthma attacks, and premature deaths. This landmark legislation, for the first time, ensured that hazardous air pollution would be controlled.

But in spite of the overwhelming evidence of the success of this law and its many vital public health benefits, the Clean Air Act continues to be a favorite target for my Republican colleagues. This bill, H.R. 4775, is, unfortunately, the latest in an ongoing attempt to undermine the progress we have made on cleaning the air and protecting public health.

The bill's sponsors claim their goal is to help States to implement the National Ambient Air Quality Standards set by the EPA, yet this bill fails to provide the one thing that would be most helpful to States in their efforts to implement air quality standards, and that is additional resources.

In fact, Chairman WHITFIELD will be offering an amendment to the bill to ensure that EPA receives no additional funding to implement the provisions of this legislation, or any of the requirements under existing law.

H.R. 4775 is not a package of minor changes to minor provisions of the Clean Air Act. These changes are radical revisions intended to roll back the progress we have made in public health. This bill alters the fundamental premise of the act, that standards should be set to ensure the air is safe and healthy to breathe.

H.R. 4775 would bring economic costs, technological feasibility, and other non-risk factors into the standard-setting process.

□ 1500

These things are important, to be sure, and that is why they are already considered when the States develop their plans to achieve the health-based standards set by EPA, and that is appropriate. They should, however, never come into play in setting these standards.

Let's just use technology as an example. Technology is always evolving. What is technologically feasible today does not define what is possible tomorrow. For example, air pollution from automobile emissions was recognized as a serious problem in southern California as early as 1959. At that time, there were no pollution-control devices for cars. Auto manufacturers said that it couldn't be done, the technology was impossible, and that even if it were possible, it would be far too expensive. But California passed laws requiring pollution control anyway.

We all know the rest of the story: it was not impossible or prohibitively expensive. People still bought cars. And we have cleaner, more efficient cars today because regulation pushed technology forward. The only reason to make technological feasibility a factor in setting the standard is to avoid setting the standard, and that is the goal of the supporters of this legislation.

The history of the Clean Air Act is one of great success: the economy has continued to grow; the air has gotten cleaner; and most importantly, public health has improved.

So, Mr. Chairman, my Republican colleagues refuse to accept the fact that we can continue to improve the air, have a vibrant economy, and give everyone the opportunity for a long and healthy life. So I urge my colleagues to reject the false choice between jobs and clean air. The fact is that we can have both.

H.R. 4775 is a dangerous bill, and I would urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on increased ozone pollution.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, we have no further speakers on our side of the aisle except for myself, and I think I have the right to close. I don't know if the gentleman from Illinois has additional speakers or if he would like to go at this time.

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, supporters of this bill claim that EPA doesn't issue implementation rules and guidance quickly enough after updating a national ambient air quality standard. So this awful piece of legislation concludes that the solution is to sacrifice Americans' health—sacrifice our public health—by allowing facilities to ignore new air quality standards. But, Mr. Chairman, this would only allow these same facilities to pollute more while doing nothing to facilitate faster implementation of new NAAQS.

The bill says that EPA must release implementing rules and guidance concurrently with a new standard, meaning, if EPA updates a national ambient air quality standard, that standard does not apply to new or expanding facilities unless and until EPA has issued implementation rules and guidance for the new standard.

Mr. Chairman, witnesses have testified that concurrent guidance isn't always practical or even necessary. This provision presumes a problem that does not even exist. The Agency provides a wealth of tools already, Mr. Chairman, to assist States with air permits, and in many cases, States are fully capable of issuing permits without any new

guidance from EPA. Mr. Chairman, they have been doing this same thing for decades now.

Most guidance evolves after a standard takes effect as States and industry raise questions that require EPA clarification. It is unclear, Mr. Chairman, how the Agency could provide guidance on solving problems before they even know what those problems are.

Mr. Chairman, you are talking about a catch-22, and this creates an epic catch-22 for the Environmental Protection Agency.

On the one hand, the EPA could hurry to issue guidance before hearing questions from States and industry. That guidance would necessarily be incomplete, as it won't even address issues that only emerge during the implementation process. An industry group, Mr. Chairman, that wanted to delay implementation of the new air quality standard could file a lawsuit saying that EPA's guidance wasn't sufficient.

On the other hand, EPA could wait to issue more robust and helpful guidance, but in the meantime, facilities would be able to obtain permits under the old air quality standard. A company, Mr. Chairman, could build a facility that is allowed to pollute more than it would under current law.

In both scenarios, Mr. Chairman, who wins? Not the American people. Who wins? The polluter wins, and our public health loses.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank our fellow legislators from the other side of the aisle for working with us on this legislation. One of the great things about the House of Representatives is we have the opportunity to come and talk on different sides of the issues. We can have different opinions, we can talk about it, disagree, and then try to move forward.

Now, some of the speakers today, when we discussed this legislation, H.R. 4775, have described it as irresponsible, as a radical action to gut the Clean Air Act, to fundamentally weaken the Clean Air Act, and to undermine the Clean Air Act. I would say that that absolutely is not our intent.

I think all of us living in America understand that we do, in this country, more than any other country in the world, work to ensure clean air for our constituents and our citizens. We don't have to take a backseat to anyone to make that statement.

I might say that the criteria of pollutants, the six of them, the emissions have been reduced by a total of 63 percent—making up the National Ambient Air Quality Standards has been reduced by 63 percent, those emissions—since 1980.

So we are committed to clean air. But many people do not realize that, today, 24 States, counties in 24 States and the District of Columbia do not even meet the requirement of the 2008 Ambient Air Quality Standards, which is 75 parts per billion. And we know that even though that standard was set in 2008, EPA did not come forth with the guidelines to help the States meet that standard until 2015—7 years later.

Now they have come out with a new standard in 2015 saying that States must meet that in 2017. This legislation is brought to the floor in response to concerns by entities and individuals responsible in the States for implementing the Federal standards set by the Federal EPA, so that is why we are here.

So what are we doing in this legislation? Let me just point out that I mentioned the 24 States, counties in 24 States and the District of Columbia are in noncompliance with the 2008 standard. Los Angeles is never going to be in compliance. San Joaquin Valley is probably never going to be in compliance, and many parts of the West are never going to be in compliance because of their geographical location and because of foreign emissions coming in from other countries.

If you are in noncompliance, it has a drastic impact on your ability to create jobs and to bring in new industry because it is much more difficult to get a permit. So these over 270 counties in these 24 States at a time when our job growth is stagnant are going to find it even more difficult to create jobs.

Poverty also has a tremendous impact on people's health. Yes, we want clean air, but we want jobs so people can provide health care for their families and their children. So we need a balancing act here, and that is what this legislation is designed to do.

Under existing law, EPA at the Federal level must, they are mandated to review the national air quality standard every 5 years. They can do it in 2 if they want to, or 3, but they must do it in 5. So, because we are now trying to implement the 2008 and the 2015 all at the same time in certain areas, all we are saying is, instead of mandating EPA to do it every 5, we mandate them to do it every 10. They can do it in 4 if they want to, or 3 or 2, but they must do it in 10. So is that irresponsible? Is that trying to gut the Clean Air Act?

What are some other things we are doing here? We are also saying that we are authorizing—we are not mandating, but we are authorizing—the EPA Administrator to consider that technology is available to meet the new standard—not that it is required to, but it is authorized to. Is that unreasonable? Is that trying to gut the Clean Air Act?

Then we are also saying, before EPA revises its National Ambient Air Quality Standards, that they must get the advice of the Agency's independent scientific advisory committee. Now they do that, but we are saying we also want you to do it to look at potential adverse effects relating to implementing a new standard as required by section 109 of the Clean Air Act.

□ 1515

So you have got this advisory body already there. We want you to talk to them and at least consider any adverse effects that may come from the new standard.

And we also are saying—we have talked about this a lot already—if you issue a new standard, at the same time give the States the implementation and guidance so they know what to do to meet the new standard instead of being 7 years late, as they were on the 2008 standard.

And then we want to ensure that for certain ozone and particulate matter nonattainment areas—and I have already talked about the nonattainment areas of the 2008—that we do not require the States to include an economically infeasible measure to meet it. In other words, if it is going to be self-defeating, if it is going to be economically infeasible, you are in a nonattainment area, you don't have to do that.

And then we want to ensure that States may seek relief with respect to certain exceptional events. For example, there are some areas of the country that are having their worst drought since the early 1800s, hundred-year droughts, and yet they can't get relief from EPA because of these exceptional events; and because of that, they are going to suffer in trying to bring in new jobs that create economic growth.

And then, finally—and this makes a lot of sense to me—I want to quote a statement that was made by a regulator from Utah. He said that international emissions and transports, dirty pollution and air coming from outside America can, at times, account for up to 85 percent of the 8-hour ambient ozone concentration in many Western States.

Many areas in the West have little chance of identifying sufficient controls to achieve attainment because they are not causing it. So we are simply saying to EPA: Do a study so that we know what is being caused by other countries. That is what this bill is all about.

I might say that we are doing this after we had four forums on the Clean Air Act, we had four hearings on the National Ambient Air Quality Standards and ozone. These suggestions were made not by Republican legislators per se, but by regulators responsible for meeting EPA standards back in their States. They came and said: Would you help us with this?

So that is what we are attempting to do.

It is not our intent to gut the Clean Air Act. We recognize how important it is. The importance of health care and clean air is a part of what America is all about.

I urge our Members to pass this legislation. It is a commonsense approach to address concerns raised by people with the responsibility of meeting the standards required by the Federal EPA.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Mr. Chair, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 4775, the Ozone Standards Implementation Act of 2016.

Protecting our air from dirty pollution should not be a partisan issue. We all want to breathe clean air. We all want our children to be able to play outside without risking an asthma attack due to high ozone levels.

Last year, the Environmental Protection Agency finalized new ozone rules designed to protect the health of all Americans, particularly those communities which are at higher risk for smog. H.R. 4775 would delay this rule and critically undermine the Clean Air Act, jeopardizing Americans' health.

In my home state of California, smog used to be so bad that people were not allowed to go outside. We have made a lot of progress since then, and the last smog alert in California occurred in 1997. H.R. 4775 represents a step backward in our nation's fight for cleaner air, and I urge my colleagues to vote.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chair, the Ozone issue is extremely complicated.

Many of our Members are probably not very familiar with the National Ambient Air Quality Standard, let alone the potential impact.

In 1993, the Environmental Protection Agency faced a choice similar to that of 2016.

After missing the 1988 and 1992 Ozone NAAQS review deadlines, the EPA settled a court decree that required a decision on whether the Agency would promulgate a new Ozone standard.

The EPA stated the following:

''Based on applicable statutory requirements and the volume of material requiring careful evaluation, the EPA estimates that it would take 2 to 3 years to incorporate over a 1,000 new health studies into criteria documents.

Given various legal constraints and the fact that EPA already missed deadlines for completion of Ozone review cycles, the Administrator concluded that the best course of action is to complete the current review based on the existing air standard and proceed as rapidly as possible with the next review.''

In 2015, the Administrator stated at the Energy and Power subcommittee hearing, ''EPA examined thousands of scientific studies, including more than 1,000 new studies published since EPA last revised the standard.''

Further, EPA, in the Ozone NAAQS proposal concluded, ''there are significant uncertainties regarding some of the studies the EPA did include regarding lowering the standard.''

EPA acknowledged there are issues with the proposed standard stating, ''Given alternative views of the currently available evidence and information expressed by some commenters, the EPA is taking comment on both the Administrator's proposed decision to revise the current primary O3 standard and the option of retaining that standard.''

EPA must address the challenges and opportunities for improving our air quality and protecting human health. The process must remain health-based but cannot be set aside when it is politically convenient.

Our industries are capable of meeting the requirements of Ozone NAAQS but not when the rules are changed or not enforced due to unknown criteria.

I support the EPA's determination but I do think there is opportunity to address some of the challenges faced by both the Agency and other stakeholders.

While I do not support the bill today, I look for opportunities to improve the process to promote the economy and public health.

The Acting CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Energy and Commerce, printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read.

The text of the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.R. 4775

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Ozone Standards Implementation Act of 2016''.

SEC. 2. FACILITATING STATE IMPLEMENTATION OF EXISTING OZONE STANDARDS.

(a) DESIGNATIONS.—

(1) DESIGNATION SUBMISSION.—Not later than October 26, 2024, notwithstanding the deadline specified in paragraph (1)(A) of section 107(d) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7407(d)), the Governor of each State shall designate in accordance with such section 107(d) all areas (or portions thereof) of the Governor's State as attainment, nonattainment, or unclassifiable with respect to the 2015 ozone standards.

(2) DESIGNATION PROMULGATION.—Not later than October 26, 2025, notwithstanding the deadline specified in paragraph (1)(B) of section 107(d) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7407(d)), the Administrator shall promulgate final designations under such section 107(d) for all areas in all States with respect to the 2015 ozone standards, including any modifications to the designations submitted under paragraph (1).

(3) STATE IMPLEMENTATION PLANS.—Not later than October 26, 2026, notwithstanding the deadline specified in section 110(a)(1) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7410(a)(1)), each State shall submit the plan required by such section 110(a)(1) for the 2015 ozone standards.

(b) CERTAIN PRECONSTRUCTION PERMITS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The 2015 ozone standards shall not apply to the review and disposition of a preconstruction permit application if—

(A) the Administrator or the State, local, or tribal permitting authority, as applicable, determines the application to be complete on or before the date of promulgation of the final designation of the area involved under subsection (a)(2); or

(B) the Administrator or the State, local, or tribal permitting authority, as applicable, publishes a public notice of a preliminary determination or draft permit for the application before the date that is 60 days after the date of promulgation of the final designation of the area involved under subsection (a)(2).

(2) RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to—

(A) eliminate the obligation of a preconstruction permit applicant to install best available control technology and lowest achievable emission rate technology, as applicable; or

(B) limit the authority of a State, local, or tribal permitting authority to impose more stringent emissions requirements pursuant to State, local, or tribal law than national ambient air quality standards.

SEC. 3. FACILITATING STATE IMPLEMENTATION OF NATIONAL AMBIENT AIR QUALITY STANDARDS.

(a) TIMELINE FOR REVIEW OF NATIONAL AMBIENT AIR QUALITY STANDARDS.—

(1) 10-YEAR CYCLE FOR ALL CRITERIA AIR POLLUTANTS.—Paragraphs (1) and (2)(B) of section 109(d) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7409(d)) are amended by striking ''five-year intervals'' each place it appears and inserting ''10-year intervals''.

(2) CYCLE FOR NEXT REVIEW OF OZONE CRITERIA AND STANDARDS.—Notwithstanding section 109(d) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7409(d)), the Administrator shall not—

(A) complete, before October 26, 2025, any review of the criteria for ozone published under section 108 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 7408) or the national ambient air quality standard for ozone promulgated under section 109 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 7409); or

(B) propose, before such date, any revisions to such criteria or standard.

(b) CONSIDERATION OF TECHNOLOGICAL FEASIBILITY.—Section 109(b)(1) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7409(b)(1)) is amended by inserting after the first sentence the following: ''If the Administrator, in consultation with the independent scientific review committee appointed under subsection (d), finds that a range of levels of air quality for an air pollutant are requisite to protect public health with an adequate margin of safety, as described in the preceding sentence, the Administrator may consider, as a secondary consideration, likely technological feasibility in establishing and revising the national primary ambient air quality standard for such pollutant.''.

(c) CONSIDERATION OF ADVERSE PUBLIC HEALTH, WELFARE, SOCIAL, ECONOMIC, OR ENERGY EFFECTS.—Section 109(d)(2) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7409(d)(2)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(D) Prior to establishing or revising a national ambient air quality standard, the Administrator shall request, and such committee shall provide, advice under subparagraph (C)(iv) regarding any adverse public health, welfare, social, economic, or energy effects which may result from various strategies for attainment and maintenance of such national ambient air quality standard.''.

(d) TIMELY ISSUANCE OF IMPLEMENTING REGULATIONS AND GUIDANCE.—Section 109 of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7409) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(e) TIMELY ISSUANCE OF IMPLEMENTING REGULATIONS AND GUIDANCE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—In publishing any final rule establishing or revising a national ambient air quality standard, the Administrator shall, as the Administrator determines necessary to assist States, permitting authorities, and permit applicants, concurrently publish regulations and guidance for implementing the standard, including information relating to submission and consideration of a preconstruction permit application under the new or revised standard.

''(2) APPLICABILITY OF STANDARD TO PRECONSTRUCTION PERMITTING.—If the Administrator fails to publish final regulations and guidance that include information relating to submission and consideration of a preconstruction permit application under a new or revised national ambient air quality standard concurrently with such standard, then such standard shall not apply to the review and disposition of a preconstruction permit application until the Administrator has published such final regulations and guidance.

''(3) RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.—

''(A) Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to preclude the Administrator from issuing regulations and guidance to assist States, permitting authorities, and permit applicants in implementing a national ambient air quality standard subsequent to publishing regulations and guidance for such standard under paragraph (1).

''(B) Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to eliminate the obligation of a preconstruction permit applicant to install best available control technology and lowest achievable emission rate technology, as applicable.

''(C) Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to limit the authority of a State, local, or

tribal permitting authority to impose more stringent emissions requirements pursuant to State, local, or tribal law than national ambient air quality standards.

''(4) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

''(A) The term 'best available control technology' has the meaning given to that term in section 169(3).

''(B) The term 'lowest achievable emission rate' has the meaning given to that term in section 171(3).

''(C) The term 'preconstruction permit'—

''(i) means a permit that is required under this title for the construction or modification of a stationary source; and

''(ii) includes any such permit issued by the Environmental Protection Agency or a State, local, or tribal permitting authority.''.

(e) CONTINGENCY MEASURES FOR EXTREME OZONE NONATTAINMENT AREAS.—Section 172(c)(9) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7502(c)(9)) is amended by adding at the end the following: ''Notwithstanding the preceding sentences and any other provision of this Act, such measures shall not be required for any nonattainment area for ozone classified as an Extreme Area.''.

(f) PLAN SUBMISSIONS AND REQUIREMENTS FOR OZONE NONATTAINMENT AREAS.—Section 182 of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7511a) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(1)(A)(ii)(III), by inserting ''and economic feasibility'' after ''technological achievability'';

(2) in subsection (c)(2)(B)(ii), by inserting ''and economic feasibility'' after ''technological achievability'';

(3) in subsection (e), in the matter preceding paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking ''The provisions of clause (ii) of subsection (c)(2)(B) (relating to reductions of less than 3 percent), the provisions of paragaphs'' and inserting ''The provisions of paragraphs''; and

(B) by striking '', and the provisions of clause (ii) of subsection (b)(1)(A) (relating to reductions of less than 15 percent)''; and

(4) in paragraph (5) of subsection (e), by striking '', if the State demonstrates to the satisfaction of the Administrator that—'' and all that follows through the end of the paragraph and inserting a period.

(g) PLAN REVISIONS FOR MILESTONES FOR PARTICULATE MATTER NONATTAINMENT AREAS.—Section 189(c)(1) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7513a(c)(1)) is amended by inserting '', which take into account technological achievability and economic feasibility,'' before ''and which demonstrate reasonable further progress''.

(h) EXCEPTIONAL EVENTS.—Section 319(b)(1)(B) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7619(b)(1)(B)) is amended—

(1) in clause (i)—

(A) by striking ''(i) stagnation of air masses or'' and inserting ''(i)(I) ordinarily occurring stagnation of air masses or (II)''; and

(B) by inserting ''or'' after the semicolon;

(2) by striking clause (ii); and

(3) by redesignating clause (iii) as clause (ii).

(i) REPORT ON EMISSIONS EMANATING FROM OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES.—Not later than 24 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator, in consultation with States, shall submit to the Congress a report on—

(1) the extent to which foreign sources of air pollution, including emissions from sources located outside North America, impact—

(A) designations of areas (or portions thereof) as nonattainment, attainment, or unclassifiable under section 107(d) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7407(d)); and

(B) attainment and maintenance of national ambient air quality standards;

(2) the Environmental Protection Agency's procedures and timelines for disposing of petitions submitted pursuant to section 179B(b) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7509a(b));

(3) the total number of petitions received by the Agency pursuant to such section 179B(b), and for each such petition the date initially submitted and the date of final disposition by the Agency; and

(4) whether the Administrator recommends any statutory changes to facilitate the more efficient review and disposition of petitions submitted pursuant to such section 179B(b).

(j) STUDY ON OZONE FORMATION.—

(1) STUDY.—The Administrator, in consultation with States and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, shall conduct a study on the atmospheric formation of ozone and effective control strategies, including—

(A) the relative contribution of man-made and naturally occurring nitrogen oxides, volatile organic compounds, and other pollutants in ozone formation in urban and rural areas, and the most cost-effective control strategies to reduce ozone; and

(B) the science of wintertime ozone formation, including photochemical modeling of wintertime ozone formation, and approaches to cost-effectively reduce wintertime ozone levels.

(2) PEER REVIEW.—The Administrator shall have the study peer reviewed by an independent panel of experts in accordance with the requirements applicable to a highly influential scientific assessment.

(3) REPORT.—The Administrator shall submit to Congress a report describing the results of the study, including the findings of the peer review panel.

(4) REGULATIONS AND GUIDANCE.—The Administrator shall incorporate the results of the study, including the findings of the peer review panel, into any Federal rules and guidance implementing the 2015 ozone standards.

SEC. 4. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) ADMINISTRATOR.—The term ''Administrator'' means the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

(2) BEST AVAILABLE CONTROL TECHNOLOGY.—The term ''best available control technology'' has the meaning given to that term in section 169(3) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7479(3)).

(3) HIGHLY INFLUENTIAL SCIENTIFIC ASSESSMENT.—The term ''highly influential scientific assessment'' means a highly influential scientific assessment as defined in the publication of the Office of Management and Budget entitled ''Final Information Quality Bulletin for Peer Review'' (70 Fed. Reg. 2664 (January 14, 2005)).

(4) LOWEST ACHIEVABLE EMISSION RATE.—The term ''lowest achievable emission rate'' has the meaning given to that term in section 171(3) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7501(3)).

(5) NATIONAL AMBIENT AIR QUALITY STANDARD.—The term ''national ambient air quality standard'' means a national ambient air quality standard promulgated under section 109 of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7409).

(6) PRECONSTRUCTION PERMIT.—The term ''preconstruction permit''—

(A) means a permit that is required under title I of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7401 et seq.) for the construction or modification of a stationary source; and

(B) includes any such permit issued by the Environmental Protection Agency or a State, local, or tribal permitting authority.

(7) 2015 OZONE STANDARDS.—The term ''2015 ozone standards'' means the national ambient air quality standards for ozone published in the Federal Register on October 26, 2015 (80 Fed. Reg. 65292).

The Acting CHAIR. No amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in House Report 114–607. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. WHITFIELD

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 114–607.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following new section:

SEC. 5. NO ADDITIONAL FUNDS AUTHORIZED.

No additional funds are authorized to be appropriated to carry out the requirements of this Act and the amendments made by this Act. Such requirements shall be carried out using amounts otherwise authorized.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 767, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 4775, as I said, requires the EPA to develop two studies and reports to submit to Congress. I talked about that in my closing statement. My amendment is relating to those studies.

The first is a study of the impacts of foreign emissions on the ability of States in America to meet new ozone standards. The second study relates to ozone formation and the effective control strategies for that.

These studies will assist EPA and State regulators in better understanding background ozone and implementing ozone standards. In its estimate for H.R. 4775—as you know, we must always consider cost—the Congressional Budget Office estimated a cost of $2 million associated with the development of these studies.

My amendment would clarify that no additional funds are authorized by this legislation. Developing the studies required by this bill is part of EPA's job and can be covered by the Agency's existing budget.

I might point out that the President's clean energy plan, which was implemented by EPA, never passed the House of Representatives, never passed the U.S. Senate, and was never even considered by the United States Congress. Yet, EPA issued that clean energy plan without any additional appropriations. I can tell you, it cost millions of dollars to do it.

This small amount to come up to reprogram funding within EPA to require these studies I do not believe is much of a burden on EPA. EPA's budget for regulatory activity is over $2 billion annually. These are analyses EPA should have already been undertaking as part of its existing responsibilities.

This amendment simply says we are not appropriating additional money. EPA can reprogram some of the $2 billion that it already has to develop

these studies and provide useful information to the States and other agencies.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Chairman, the Congressional Budget Office identified an additional $2 million that will be needed to conduct the duplicative study required by this bill.

Mr. Chairman, that is the reason we are actually seeing this amendment. It is a Republican classic trick. It is a trick, Mr. Chairman. My colleague from Kentucky—who I respect and honor tremendously—knows that although this bill will require additional resources to implement, this amendment ensures that no new resources will be provided. It is a trick, Mr. Chairman.

My Republican colleagues have voted time and time again to cut the EPA's budget, but that just places greater burdens on States since about one-third of EPA's budget is distributed to the States in grants and other types of assistance. They will say on the other side that the goal is efficiency and that EPA must learn to do more with less. But, Mr. Chairman—another part of the trick—their real goal is to have EPA do less, rather than more with less. They just want them to do even less.

Well, Mr. Chairman, that just removes the environmental cop from the beat. Polluters benefit, but our constituents don't benefit. And, ultimately, Mr. Chairman, all of us Americans will pay the enormous price.

Much of the permitting and much of the preparation of implementation plans done under the Clean Air Act is done by the States. One of the complaints that we have heard is that EPA is not providing sufficient guidance early enough in the process to assist States in meeting their obligations under the law, and that States want and need assistance.

Well, Mr. Chairman, this amendment doesn't do anything to address that concern. In fact, it will only make a dire situation even more dire. The public expects EPA to protect their health and the environment. Resources, Mr. Chairman, are required to fulfill that expectation and that mandate.

Public health is worth paying for. It is much more cost effective to prevent health problems than it is to cure those very same problems. And make no mistake, the Clean Air Act is, indeed, a public health law. We save billions and billions of dollars in medical expenses due to asthma-related emergency room visits and other respiratory and cardiac illness. We save billions and billions in lost sick time at work, school, and other productive activities. And, most important, Mr. Chairman, let us not forget that the Clean Air Act saves lives. We enable people to be healthier and more productive.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. OLSON).

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Chairman, I support this amendment. It is real simple. This says to the EPA: Do your job. Do your job.

EPA admits half of the ozone in America comes from ''uncontrolled sources,'' ''uncontrolled sources.'' That means sources we can't control. Sources like ozone from China, like ozone in my home State from Mexico, like ozone coming from annual crop burnings, like ozone coming across the Atlantic from Sub-Saharan Africa sandstorms, like ozone coming from all over the world.

This past Christmas, my wife and I went to the Grand Canyon—beautiful. It has an ozone problem. They have a sign there that says:

Most of the Grand Canyon air pollutants come from distant sources ignoring human boundaries.

All this amendment says is: EPA, do your job. Do the research to find out where this is coming from and don't penalize Americans for something they can't control.

I support this amendment.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky will be postponed.

□ 1530

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. RUSH

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 114–607.

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 7, lines 24 and 25, strike ''If the Administrator fails'' and insert the following:

''(A) STANDARD NOT APPLICABLE.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), if the Administrator fails

Page 8, after line 8, add the following:

''(B) STANDARD APPLICABLE.—Subparagraph (A) shall not apply with respect to review and disposition of a preconstruction permit application by a Federal, State, local, or tribal permitting authority if such authority determines that application of such subparagraph is likely to—

''(i) increase air pollution that harms human health and the environment;

''(ii) slow issuance of final preconstruction permits;

''(iii) increase regulatory uncertainty;

''(iv) foster additional litigation;

''(v) shift the burden of pollution control from new sources to existing sources of pollution, including small businesses; or

''(vi) increase the overall cost of achieving the new or revised national ambient air quality standard in the applicable area.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 767, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Chair, my list of concerns with H.R. 4775 are many, but one of the main issues I have with this legislation is that it would permanently weaken the Clean Air Act as well as future air pollution health standards for all criteria pollutants.

In fact, Mr. Chair, in addition to delaying scientifically based health standards and harming the public interest, this bill may also have unintended consequences for the very industries that the majority is trying to help. If enacted, this bill may actually slow down the issuance of preconstruction permits, increase regulatory uncertainty, lead to additional lawsuits, and shift the burden of pollution control from new sources to existing ones, potentially hurting small businesses.

Mr. Chair, section 3(d) requires the EPA to issue rules and guidance for implementing new or revised National Ambient Air Quality Standards ''concurrently'' when issuing the new standard. Otherwise, under this legislation, expanding facilities would only have to comply with the outdated standards, allowing some facilities to pollute more than their fair share. This bill, Mr. Chair, would also unfairly shift the burden and the cost of cleaning up pollution to existing facilities, and it would only serve to slow down the preconstruction permitting process.

My amendment, Mr. Chair, seeks to address many of the problems that may result from this bill, both intentionally and unintentionally. The Rush amendment would strike the section that exempts preconstruction permit applications from complying with new or revised National Ambient Air Quality Standards if guidelines are not published concurrently with those regulations.

Specifically, the amendment simply states that section 3(d) shall not apply with respect to the review and disposition of a preconstruction permit application by a Federal, State, local, or tribal permitting authority if such authority determines that the application of such subparagraph is likely to increase air pollution that harms human health and the environment; to slow the issuance of final preconstruction permits; to increase regulatory uncertainty; to foster additional litigation; to shift the burden of pollution control from new sources to existing sources of pollution, including small businesses; or to increase the

overall cost of achieving the new or revised National Ambient Air Quality Standard in the applicable area.

Mr. Chair, the new standard that the EPA recently issued already represents a measured approach that seeks to balance both public health impacts as well as the rule's overall cost benefit, even though this is not a requirement of the Clean Air Act. On the other hand, Mr. Chair, H.R. 4775 represents the exact opposite of a measured approach as it seeks to tip the scales in favor of industry over public health.

Mr. Chair, this amendment will help to prevent some of the adverse consequences of this bill from going into effect whether they be intended or unintended, and I urge all of my colleagues to support it.

Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Chair, the intent of this bill is to end the nightmare scenario we are going through right now by which the EPA issues regulations 7 years after it announces a new rule, and it piles on a new regulation 6 months later. But don't take my word with regard to the problems that it causes in America; listen to the States.

Teresa Marks, Arkansas' Department of Environmental Quality, July 31, 2012:

Five years may not allow enough time for new technology or science to be fully developed. With more time between review processes, the States could have adequate time to develop proper SIPs and meet Federal deadlines.

Martha Rudolph, Colorado's Department of Public Health and Environment, July 23, 2012:

This ambitious schedule for evaluating and promulgating NAAQS revisions every 5 years has created an inefficient planning process.

I saved the best for last.

Michael Krancer, Pennsylvania's Department of Environmental Protection, November 29, 2012:

The development of the NAAQS on an interval of 5 years, section 109(d)(1), has created significant resource burdens for both the EPA and the States. Furthermore, the cascading standards can create confusion for the public actions because, as the State's EPA continues to work on SIP revisions and the determination of attainment for one standard with the ozone, the air quality index is based on another. NAAQS review intervals should be lengthened to 10 years.

Section 3(d) of this bill provides that a new rule or a revised standard shall not apply to pending permit applications until the Agency has published regulations and guidance about how to implement the new standards in the permitting process.

If a State, local, or tribal permitting authority wants to impose more stringent standards with respect to a particular preconstruction permit application, nothing in H.R. 4775 prevents it from doing so. This amendment allows the EPA to escape its responsibility for issuing timely guidance. We should ensure the EPA has to take timely action. I urge a ''no'' vote on this amendment.

Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. PALLONE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 114–607.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 6, strike lines 9 through 20, strike subsection (b) (relating to consideration of technological feasiblity) and redesignate the subsequent subsections accordingly.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 767, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chair, my amendment is straightforward, and it fixes one of the most egregious provisions in the bill: the consideration of technological feasibility in the NAAQS-setting process. The bill's approach would make feasibility a factor in the scientific decision about how much pollution is safe for a child to breathe without experiencing an asthma attack.

Requiring the EPA to consider technological feasibility when setting an air quality standard is a dangerous precedent that ignores the history of the Clean Air Act. Frankly, it is not even necessary. Since 1970, the Clean Air Act has had several key features that have helped make it one of the most successful environmental laws in our country. The law's science-based, health-protective standards keep our eye on the prize, which is healthy air for everyone. Cooperative federalism allows the EPA to set the clean air goals and States to then decide how best to achieve them.

The Clean Air Act uses regulatory standards, like the National Ambient Air Quality Standards, to drive technological innovation in pollution controls. The act recognizes that it is usually less costly to simply dump pollution rather than to clean it up, so businesses generally don't control pollution absent regulatory requirements.

We know from decades of experience that the Clean Air Act drives innovations in pollution controls that then become the industry standard. Once an air pollution standard is in place, industry gets to work to meet it, and, along the way, we develop more effective and less expensive pollution control technologies. Not only is our air cleaner, but we also export tens of millions of dollars of pollution control equipment all over the world. We have seen that happen over and over again.

Mr. Chair, section 3(b) ignores this fact and rejects an approach that has been successful for over four decades; so my amendment would restore current law, preserving the NAAQS as purely health-based standards and leaving the consideration of costs and feasibility to the States. If you truly believe that this bill is not an attack on the Clean Air Act and its critical public health protection, then supporting my amendment should not be a problem.

In closing, almost every time the EPA proposes a significant new requirement, opponents tell us it can't be done, that it is going to cost too much, or that it will destroy our economy. The Republicans are once again raising the false specter of job losses and high economic costs to try to block the implementation of stronger ozone standards. These doomsday claims about the costs of clean air are nothing new. The history of the Clean Air Act is a history of exaggerated claims by industry that have never come true.

Section 3(b) is just the latest in a string of reckless legislative attacks on these purely health-based air quality standards, which could unravel the entire framework of the Clean Air Act. It ignores decades of experience in cleaning up air pollution, and it is an extreme and, in my opinion, irresponsible proposal that would put the health of all Americans at risk. I urge the adoption of my amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Chair, for the Members who are thinking about voting for this amendment, I will simply say: Read the bill.

Section 3(b) states that, if the EPA Administrator, in consultation with the EPA's independent scientific advisory committee, finds a range of levels of air quality that protect public health with an adequate margin of safety, then—and only then—''the Administrator may consider as secondary consideration likely technological feasibility in establishing and revising the national primary ambient air quality standard for this pollutant.''

It reads ''may,'' not ''must,'' not ''shall''—but ''may.''

H.R. 4775 does not change the Clean Air Act's requirement that standards be based on public health. This is a clarification for future administrations that Congress considers technical feasibility to be a reasonable part of the decisionmaking process when policy

choices must be made among a range of scientifically valid options.

I urge a ''no'' vote on this amendment.

Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I have listened to what the gentleman has said. It seems to me that he is essentially making an argument as to why we don't need this change. If he is saying that the underlying bill—the current law, the current statute—allows for the consideration of technological feasibility and if we know that the Clean Air Act has essentially worked in protecting the environment and in putting health as a priority with these other issues as simply being something that can be considered and, as I said, is considered when the States actually decide how to carry out the law, then I do not understand why he finds it necessary to change the law, say, with regard to this issue.

□ 1545

It seems to me that the argument you are making, which is that this is already something that can be considered but is not a priority—health being the priority—would negate the very need for the legislation and support the amendment that I am putting forward.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in House Report 114–607.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 13, line 1, after ''rural areas,'' insert ''including during wildfires,''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 767, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer a commonsense amendment that will ensure that the study on ozone formation in the underlying bill analyzes the relative contribution from wildfires.

The National Interagency Coordination Center reported this year that we set a new record in terms of total acreage burned from wildfires with more than 10.1 million acres going up in smoke. This significant increase is not the result of more wildfires, as the nonpartisan Congressional Research Service reported last month that ''the number of wildfires has stayed about the same over the last 30 years, but the number of acres burned annually has increased by nearly double the acreage burned in the 1990s.''

Timber removal is down 80 percent over the last 30 years and acreage has burned up. There is a direct correlation between thinning our forest and overall forest health. As a medical professional for over 25 years, I know firsthand that preventive care is a much cheaper and effective treatment as opposed to dealing with an illness or disease after it has already been diagnosed. Let's not forget the old adage that an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure.

Unfortunately, the Federal Government has failed to employ such a strategy when it comes to our Nation's forests and continues to spend billions of dollars on the back end of suppression activities.

The CRS reports that the top 5 years with the largest wildfire acreage burned since 1960 all occurred between 2006 and 2015. In Arizona, we have seen the tragic results of this agency's misprioritization firsthand, as the five largest fires in Arizona's history occurred between 2002 and 2011.

Data released from NASA a few years ago concluded that one catastrophic wildfire can emit more carbon emissions in a few days than total vehicle emissions in an entire State over the course of a year.

My commonsense amendment simply seeks to determine the overall contribution to ozone formation from wildfires. We should all want to have this information and know the extent to which ozone formation from wildfire emissions occurs.

I am proud to be a cosponsor of the underlying bill and applaud Representative OLSON, Chairman UPTON, and my other colleagues who are actively involved with moving this much-needed legislation forward.

Most States are just beginning to adopt the 2008 ozone standards as the EPA didn't announce the implementation guidance and a final rule until March 6, 2015. Rather than allowing time for those standards to be implemented, the EPA moved the goalposts and is seeking to unilaterally implement a regulation that has been projected to be the most expensive mandate in our Nation's history.

The Arizona Chamber of Commerce and Industry recently reported that ''the EPA's new ozone standard of 70 parts per billion will be virtually impossible for Arizona to meet due to Arizona's high levels of background, limited local sources, and unique geography'' and that ''implementation of the current rule in Arizona is not reasonable, based in sound science, or achievable.''

Again, my amendment simply ensures that the study on ozone formation in the underlying bill analyzes the relative contribution from wildfires. Chairman UPTON supports my amendment, and I wholeheartedly support the underlying bill.

I ask my colleagues to do the same and support my amendment and H.R. 4775.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, on its face, Mr. GOSAR's amendment seems innocuous enough, having EPA also consider the contribution of wildfires in the bill's required study on ozone formation, wintertime ozone formation, and control strategies. But in reality, this study is a wolf in sheep's clothing. So adding further criteria, as this amendment would do, only makes it worse.

First, many of the aspects of this proposed study are already covered by EPA's integrated science assessment. Integrated science assessments are reports that represent concise evaluations and synthesis of the most policy-relevant science for reviewing National Ambient Air Quality Standards. Essentially, these assessments form the scientific foundation for the review of the NAAQ Standards. All integrated science assessments are vetted through a rigorous peer-review process, including review by the Clean Air Scientific Advisory Committee and public comment periods.

Furthermore, the EPA is already doing a comprehensive review of wildfires and ozone, so additional study of this issue is not necessary, in my opinion.

But this study is more than a duplication of work already being done, Mr. Chairman. The bill would inject costs into this scientific review process by requiring the assessment of cost-effective control strategies to reduce ozone. While this is certainly worthy as an issue to review, EPA's scientific assessments are the wrong venue for such a discussion.

Requiring EPA to do additional assessments of cost-effective control strategies would, of course, pull the Agency's limited staff and resources away from the public health priorities of implementing and reviewing the NAAQ Standards in a timely manner outlined in the Clean Air Act. When viewed in connection with the other provisions of this bill, like the requirement that implementing regulations and guidance must be issued concurrently with an air quality standard for preconstruction permits, expanding this study would only serve to further delay implementation of the 2015 ozone standard.

The 2015 ozone NAAQS update is long overdue, and the bill before us doesn't need any further procedural hoops for

EPA to jump through before a more protective ozone standard can be put into effect.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, once again, this three-word amendment simply ensures that the study on ozone formation in the underlying bill analyzes the relative contribution from wildfires. Just simply that.

This is something that I would hope would be analyzed anyway under the language in the underlying bill, but I felt the need to clarify so as to ensure such analysis occurs.

Data released from NASA a few years ago concluded that one catastrophic wildfire can emit more carbon emissions in a few days than total vehicle emissions in an entire State over the course of a year. We should all want to have this information and know the extent to which ozone formation from wildfire emissions occurs. The science is science, the whole science, nothing less, nothing more.

I ask everybody to vote for this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I urge a ''no'' vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. POLIS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in House Report 114–607.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

After section 3, insert the following sections:

SEC. 4. REPEAL OF EXEMPTION FOR AGGREGATION OF EMISSIONS FROM OIL AND GAS SOURCES.

Section 112(n) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7412(n)) is amended by striking paragraph (4).

SEC. 5. HYDROGEN SULFIDE AS A HAZARDOUS AIR POLLUTANT.

The Administrator shall—

(1) not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, issue a final rule adding hydrogen sulfide to the list of hazardous air pollutants under section 112(b) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7412(b)); and

(2) not later than 365 days after a final rule under paragraph (1) is issued, revise the list under section 112(c) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 7412(c)) to include categories and subcategories of major sources and area sources of hydrogen sulfide, including oil and gas wells.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 767, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, since this bill is supposed to be about making the Clean Air Act work better, I have offered an amendment—that is identical to a bill with 64 cosponsors that I coauthored—to close a very glaring loophole in the law that frankly harms the air in my State, across the Mountain West, and indeed across the country.

My amendment, which is based off legislation I first introduced in 2011 and have introduced three times, including this Congress, is called the BREATHE Act. Essentially it is very simple. It would close the oil and gas industry's loophole to the Clean Air Act's aggregation requirement. Currently, oil and gas operators are exempt from the aggregation requirements in the Clean Air Act.

What the aggregation requirement does, it is small air pollution sources that cumulatively release as much air pollution as a major source, are supposed to be required to curb pollution by installing the maximum achievable control technology. But oil and gas is exempt, not for any policy reason, but simply because oil and gas has a lot of influence here in Washington, D.C.

This directly affects the air quality in my district. Take a county like Weld County, Colorado. There are over 20,000 operating fracking wells. Any one of those has a very small emissions profile. But in the aggregate, when you start talking about 1,000, 5,000, 10,000, it looks a lot more like multiple emissions-spewing factories or other highly pollutive activity. And yet they are completely exempt from being aggregated.

So essentially, they are rounded to down to zero, each one of them, which is fine if there is one or three or five of them. But if you have 20,000 of them, it is a gross abuse of the intent of the Clean Air Act to round it down to zero.

My amendment would also add hydrogen sulfide to the Clean Air Act's Federal list of hazardous air pollutants. It was originally on the list. Unfortunately, it was later removed.

The Clean Air Act currently exempts hydrogen sulfide from the Federal list of hazardous air pollutants, even though it is well-documented that hydrogen sulfide has been associated with a wide range of health issues, such as nausea, vomiting, headaches, irritation of eyes, nose, throat, and asthma.

Often, it is released from wellheads, pumps, and piping during the separation process, from storage tanks, and from flaring. In fact, 15 percent to 25 percent of the natural gas wells in the U.S. emit hydrogen sulfide, even though, I would point out, control technologies are inexpensive and readily available to curb hydrogen sulfide emissions. All we ask is that those are looked at as part of that.

My amendment has broad support with 64 Members that have added their names as cosponsors. I am grateful this was allowed under the bill.

My amendment will simply hold oil and gas operators accountable for their impact on our Nation's air quality, as every industry should be. They shouldn't play by special rules. They should play by the same rules under the Clean Air Act as every industry.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, we all have a great deal of respect for the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) and know that he focuses on these particular issues and is quite familiar with them.

The reason that we are opposing this amendment is that his amendment would make changes to section 112 of the Clean Air Act by adding, specifically, hydrogen sulfide as a hazardous air pollutant.

Now, there is a well-established regulatory process for listing new hazardous air pollutants set forth in the Clean Air Act, section 112.

The underlying legislation, H.R. 4775, really is dealing only with sections 107 to 110 and part C and D of title I of the Clean Air Act. And we are not doing anything with section 112, nor have we had any hearings in the Energy and Commerce Committee on adding hydrogen sulfide as a hazardous air pollutant. On the other hand, we have had four hearings about ambient air quality standards. We have had four forums on the Clear Air Act relating to ambient air quality standards.

So for that reason, the fact that there is an established way to add, we would respectfully oppose this amendment and ask the other Members to oppose it at this time. We would welcome the opportunity to work with Mr. POLIS in letting the Energy and Commerce Committee do it in a regular manner.

I oppose the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 45 seconds to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE).

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I urge support for the Polis amendment. It is common sense, and it certainly improves the bill in the way that Mr. POLIS set forth.

I would urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

So again, with great respect to the gentleman from Kentucky, this is the first opportunity we have had since I first introduced the bill in 2011 where the Clean Air Act has been brought to the floor and opened and allowed to have this amendment and discussion. I personally would have been thrilled if we would have been able to have a hearing in the intervening years. Of course, should this not prevail, I would be happy to continue to work to pursue a hearing in this area.

Because frankly, again, when you have 20,000 wells in a limited area, you can't round each one down to zero. Separately, we have the issue of hydrogen sulfide. Both are very important issues.

Of course, we want to further the discussion.

I personally am thrilled again on behalf of the 64 Members that are already cosponsors of this bill that at least we have the time to debate this on the floor in a way that it is germane to a bill that we are considering in opening up the Clean Air Act.

□ 1600

Certainly I am appreciative of the process the committee has in place. Again, should this not prevail, I would be happy to continue to work with the committee to help deal with these small-site aggregations in a way where they are no longer rounded down to zero if, in fact, they are found scientifically to have a tangible cumulative effect, just like we have the aggregation of every other type of industrial activity except for those that are particular to oil and gas.

I would encourage my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on the bill to simply make sure that oil and gas operators play by the same rules with regard to their impact on air quality as any other industry, as well as adding hydrogen sulfide to the list of hazardous air pollutants and listing, of course, oil and gas wells as one of the major sources of hydrogen sulfide, as they certainly are in my neck of the woods.

I ask my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MS. NORTON

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in House Report 114–607.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following new section:

SEC. 5. LIMITATION.

If the Administrator, in consultation with the Clean Air Scientific Advisory Committee, finds that application of any provision of this Act could harm human health or the environment, this Act and the amendments made thereby shall cease to apply.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 767, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, I rise to offer an amendment to the Ozone Standards Implementation Act of 2016 that would ensure that the environment and human health aspects are protected. The amendment states that if the EPA Administrator, in consultation with the Clean Air Scientific Advisory Committee, finds that application of any provision of this act could harm human health or the environment, the Ozone Standards Implementation Act shall cease to apply.

The Ozone Standards Implementation Act puts our children, communities, and environment at extreme risk simply to benefit private corporations rather than to look at what the act could do to people. It weakens implementation and enforcement of the Clean Air Act's essential air pollution health standards, further delays reductions in smog pollution, and expands the very definition of ''exceptional events'' to include high pollution days when communities exclude certain extreme events, like wildfires, in determining whether their air quality meets national standards. The bill also takes health and medical science out of the process.

My amendment ensures that we will fulfill the purpose of the Clean Air Act and continue the progress we have made over the past 46 years. One fact pointed out by the Statement of Administration Policy is that the ''emissions of key pollutants have decreased by nearly 70 percent while the economy has tripled in size.'' This proves that we can both improve the environment and still grow our domestic economy.

Right now, just to cite my own district as an example, 17,000 children in the District of Columbia have pediatric asthma and over 115,000 children and teens in the District are at risk of health implications from smog. Our health and future depend on the Clean Air Act, but the Ozone Standards Implementation Act will put us right back where we were before 1970.

I urge the adoption of my amendment.

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Chairman, since 1980, ozone levels have decreased by 33 percent, and EPA projects air quality ''will continue to improve over the next decade as additional reductions in ozone precursors from power plants, motor vehicles, and other sources are realized.''

Nothing in this bill changes any existing air quality standards or prevents these improvements to air quality from being realized.

This amendment, however, would allow the EPA, in consultation with CASAC, the Clean Air Scientific Advisory Committee, to invalidate the entire bill. Why we would give CASAC this power is beyond me because they haven't done a good job with ozone.

Under the Clean Air Act, CASAC is required to provide advice to the Agency about the potential adverse effects of implementing new air quality standards. Section 109(d)(2)(C)(iv) expressly requires CASAC to ''advise the Administrator of any adverse public health, welfare, social, economic, or energy effects which may result from various strategies for attainment and maintenance of such national ambient air quality standards.'' Despite this provision, CASAC has not provided that advice.

In May of 2015, the Government Accountability Office issued a report indicating that CASAC has never provided that advice because EPA has never requested that advice, and that EPA has no plans to ask CASAC to provide advice on potential adverse effects. In a recent survey, 80 percent of State air agencies said that such advice would be helpful to their agency.

H.R. 4775 will ensure that such advice is provided and also ensure that States have the time and regulatory tools they need to comply with new ozone rules and other air quality standards.

I urge a ''no'' vote on this amendment.

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, part of the problem is, perhaps, that EPA has never requested this particular advice from CASAC. My amendment would make it clear that Congress wants the EPA to do so. Yes, I made clear that there had been improvements in air quality, despite the fact that our own industry, our own economic growth has tripled. Would anybody say that we are now where we want to be?

We do not want, at this point of progress, to countermand the progress we have made. We should be building on that progress. No one, I think, in the world today—and certainly in the United States—would say we have finally reached where we want to be. The improvements are not nearly enough. We need to go much more rapidly. We certainly don't need to be retrograde at this point in history when the whole world now is looking at this very issue and seeking to improve.

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Chairman, I will offer a quote from the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District executive director. He said these words before our committee: ''H.R. 4775, in my opinion, provides for much-needed streamlining of the implementation of the Clean Air Act. It does not roll back anything that is already in the Clean Air Act in the form of protections for public health, safeguarding public health, and it does nothing to roll back any of the progress that has been made, and it will not impede or slow down our progress as we move forward to reduce air pollution and improve public health.''

This amendment trashes that statement.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, we should all be grateful to the authors of the Clean Air Act for the progress we have achieved. The way to express our gratitude is to use an occasion like this to expand, not to retract, that act.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 114–607 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 by Mr. WHITFIELD of Kentucky.

Amendment No. 2 by Mr. RUSH of Illinois.

Amendment No. 3 by Mr. PALLONE of New Jersey.

Amendment No. 5 by Mr. POLIS of Colorado.

Amendment No. 6 by Ms. NORTON of the District of Columbia.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. WHITFIELD

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 236, noes 170, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 276]

AYES—236

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOES—170

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—27

Black
Cárdenas
Clark (MA)
Duffy
Ellmers (NC)
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Franks (AZ)
Gosar
Hahn
Hardy
Herrera Beutler
Jeffries
Lieu, Ted
Nadler
Payne
Rice (NY)
Roby
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Scott, David
Sires
Smith (NE)
Takai
Walters, Mimi
Waters, Maxine

□ 1632

Mr. LANGEVIN and Ms. JACKSON LEE changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mrs. ROBY. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 276 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. RUSH

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 171, noes 235, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 277]

AYES—171

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps

Capuano
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Gibson
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—235

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Costello (PA)
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frelinghuysen
Garamendi
Garrett
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—27

Black
Cárdenas
Cramer
Duffy
Ellmers (NC)
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Franks (AZ)
Hahn
Hardy
Herrera Beutler
Hurt (VA)
Jeffries
Lieu, Ted
Nadler
Payne
Roe (TN)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sires
Stutzman
Takai
Tiberi
Wagner
Walters, Mimi
Waters, Maxine

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1636

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. HURT of Virginia. Mr. Chair, I was not present for rollcall vote No. 277 on the Rush of Illinois Amendment No. 2 on H.R. 4775. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. PALLONE

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 169, noes 242, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 278]

AYES—169

Adams
Aguilar
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Ros-Lehtinen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sherman
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—242

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk

Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—22

Black
Cárdenas
Duffy
Ellmers (NC)
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Franks (AZ)
Hahn
Hardy
Herrera Beutler
Jeffries
Lieu, Ted
Nadler
Payne
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sires
Takai
Walters, Mimi
Waters, Maxine
Westmoreland

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1640

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. POLIS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 160, noes 251, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 279]

AYES—160

Adams
Aguilar
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carney
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Gutiérrez
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sherman
Sinema
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—251

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Veasey
Vela
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—22

Black
Cárdenas
Duffy
Ellmers (NC)
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Franks (AZ)
Grijalva
Hahn
Hardy
Herrera Beutler
Jeffries
Lieu, Ted
Nadler
Payne
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sires
Takai
Walters, Mimi
Waters, Maxine

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1644

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MS. NORTON

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 171, noes 239, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 280]

AYES—171

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette

Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Reichert
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—239

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—23

Black
Cárdenas
Duffy
Ellmers (NC)
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Franks (AZ)
Hahn
Hardy
Herrera Beutler
Jeffries
Johnson (OH)
Lieu, Ted
Nadler
Payne
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sires
Takai
Walters, Mimi
Waters, Maxine
Young (AK)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1647

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK) having assumed the chair, Mr. HULTGREN, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4775) to facilitate efficient State implementation of ground-level ozone standards, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 767, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole?

If not, the question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. RUSH. I am opposed in its current form.

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order against the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A point of order is reserved.

The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Rush moves to recommit the bill H.R. 4775 to the Committee on Energy and Commerce with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

Page 5, after line 11, insert the following:

(c) LIMITATION.—If the Administrator, in consultation with the Clean Air Scientific Advisory Committee, finds that application of subsection (a) could increase the incidence of asthma attacks, respiratory disease, cardiovascular disease, stroke, heart attacks, babies born with low birth weight and impaired fetal growth, neurological damage, premature mortality, or other serious harms to human health, especially for vulnerable populations such as pregnant women, children, the elderly, outdoor workers, and low income communities, then this section shall cease to apply.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill, which will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage, as amended.

Mr. Speaker, it appears that the Republican Party has truly fallen in line behind its standard-bearer, Donald Trump, and is content to put industry profits over the public interest. Mr. Speaker, the art of the deal should not mean putting corporate welfare over the public well-being.

Mr. Speaker, our agreement is nonnegotiable. Protecting the public health is absolutely why we are here in this Congress today.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4775 is a disastrous bill that will put our most vulnerable citizens, including the elderly, the young, pregnant women, and low-income communities, at substantial risk.

This bill unacceptably delays implementation of EPA's 2015 ozone standards for another 8 years, while also delaying any new evidence regarding the health implications from ozone and other harmful pollutants for at least a decade, despite what the science may say in the interval.

In fact, under this legislation, not only will States be exempt from complying with the 2015 standards until 2016, but parents—our parents—and our loved ones, Mr. Speaker, will not even be informed if their communities were in violation of clean air standards until the year 2025.

Mr. Speaker, I can think of no benefit to the public interest of denying citizens information directly tied to their health and to their well-being.

The research, Mr. Speaker, informs us that breathing in dirty pollutants

such as ozone, carbon monoxide, lead, nitrogen, sulfur dioxide, and other dirty pollutants can lead to a host of problems, including asthma, inflammation of the lungs, respiratory disease, and even premature death.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, despite all of the scientific research, this bill will stall the new ozone standards, permanently weaken the Clean Air Act, and hamstring EPA's ability to regulate these harmful contaminants, both now and in the future.

Mr. Speaker, in order to address some of the deficiencies found in this bill, I am offering an amendment that would nullify sections from taking effect if they may result in adverse public health impacts.

This amendment simply states that section 2(a) would cease to apply if the EPA Administrator, in consultation with the Clean Air Scientific Advisory Committee, finds that it could increase health problems, including asthma attacks, respiratory disease, cardiovascular disease, stroke, heart attacks, babies with low birth weight and impaired fetal growth, neurological damage, premature mortality, or other serious harms to human health, especially for America's most vulnerable populations such as pregnant women, children, the elderly, outdoor workers, and low-income communities.

Mr. Speaker, this is a commonsense and compassionate amendment that seeks to put the interests of the public health above the profits of industry, and I urge all my colleagues to support it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The reservation of the point of order is withdrawn.

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I claim the time in opposition to the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I want healthy air. Everyone here in this Chamber wants healthy air. Every American wants healthy air.

Where I live in the greater Houston area, we have struggled with air quality, but we are making great progress. In fact, communities all across America have cut ozone levels by one-third in the last few decades. That progress must continue, and that is why this bill is not about blocking the path forward on clean air.

As a top air official in California said about H.R. 4775: ''It does not roll back anything that is already in the Clean Air Act in the form of protections for public health . . . it will not slow down our progress as we move forward to reduce air pollution and improve public health.''

There has never been a regulator in this country who wants to drag their feet on clean air. Our States have said for years that they face real challenges under current law. Addressing those real challenges is what this bill is all about.

□ 1700

That is why we need H.R. 4775. It gives our local officials the tools they need to make the Clean Air Act work. It tackles the challenges of States being asked to implement overlapping regulations.

H.R. 4775 will let EPA consider whether its rules are achievable, but never putting cost ahead of public health when setting a new standard.

H.R. 4775 will make sure that clean air rules are implemented fairly, and that communities like mine and yours aren't penalized for emissions they can't control.

In 2008, the Bush administration put out lower ozone standards. In 2015, the Obama administration finally put out rules for 2008 standards. America lost 7 years of cleaner air. And then, in late 2015, the Obama administration put out even lower standards.

Are we going to lose 7 more years of cleaner air?

Albert Einstein said that the definition of insanity is doing the same thing over and over again and expecting different results. Let's not repeat the last 7 years of ozone insanity.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the motion to recommit. Give our local communities the ozone sanity they crave and deserve. Vote ''yes'' for final passage.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 5-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by a 5-minute vote on the passage of the bill, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 173, noes 239, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 281]

AYES—173

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blum
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—239

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Keating
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry

Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—21

Black
Cárdenas
Duffy
Ellmers (NC)
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Hahn
Hardy
Herrera Beutler
Jeffries
Lieu, Ted
Nadler
Payne
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sires
Takai
Walters, Mimi
Waters, Maxine
Woodall

□ 1707

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 234, nays 177, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 282]

YEAS—234

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donovan
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Salmon
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NAYS—177

Adams
Aguilar
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibson
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pocan
Poliquin
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Reichert
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Ros-Lehtinen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sherman
Sinema
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stefanik
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—22

Black
Cárdenas
Duffy
Ellmers (NC)
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Hahn
Hardy
Herrera Beutler
Hultgren
Jeffries
Lieu, Ted
Nadler
Payne
Pingree
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sires
Takai
Walters, Mimi
Waters, Maxine

□ 1714

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, rollcall No. 273—I would have voted "yes." Rollcall No. 274—I would have voted "yes." Rollcall No. 275—I would have voted "yes." Rollcall No. 276—I would have voted "yes." Rollcall No. 277—I would have voted "no." Rollcall No. 278—I would have voted "no." Rollcall No. 279—I would have voted "no." Rollcall No. 280—I would have voted "no." Rollcall No. 281—I would have voted "no." Rollcall No. 282—I would have voted "yes."

MAKING IN ORDER CONSIDERATION OF VETO MESSAGE ON H.J. RES. 88

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when a veto message on House Joint Resolution 88 is laid before the House on this legislative day, then after the message is read and the objections of the President are spread at large upon the Journal, further consideration of the veto message and the joint resolution shall be postponed until the legislative day of Wednesday, June 22, 2016; and that on that legislative day, the House shall proceed to the constitutional question of reconsideration and dispose of such question without intervening motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

NULLIFY DEPARTMENT OF LABOR'S FINAL CONFLICT OF INTEREST RULE—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 114–140)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States:

To the House of Representatives:

I am returning herewith without my approval H.J. Res. 88, a resolution that would nullify the Department of Labor's final conflict of interest rule. This rule is critical to protecting Americans' hard-earned savings and preserving their retirement security.

The outdated regulations in place before this rulemaking did not ensure that financial advisers act in their clients, best interests when giving retirement investment advice. Instead, some firms have incentivized advisers to steer clients into products that have higher fees and lower returns—costing America's families an estimated $17 billion a year.

The Department of Labor's final rule will ensure that American workers and retirees receive retirement advice that is in their best interest, better enabling them to protect and grow their savings. The final rule reflects extensive feedback from industry, advocates, and Members of Congress, and has been streamlined to reduce the compliance burden and ensure continued access to advice, while maintaining an enforceable best interest standard that protects consumers. It is essential that these critical protections go into effect. Because this resolution seeks to block the progress represented by this rule and deny retirement savers investment advice in their best interest, I cannot support it. I am therefore vetoing this resolution.

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 8, 2016*.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal, and the veto message and the joint resolution will be printed as a House document.

Pursuant to the order of the House of today, further consideration of the veto message and the bill are postponed until the legislative day of Wednesday, June 22, 2016, and that on that legislative day, the House shall proceed to the constitutional question of reconsideration and dispose of such question without intervening motion.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on the motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Any record vote on the postponed question will be taken later.

SECURING AMERICA'S FUTURE ENERGY: PROTECTING OUR INFRASTRUCTURE OF PIPELINES AND ENHANCING SAFETY ACT

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 2276) to amend title 49, United States Code, to provide enhanced safety in pipeline transportation, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 2276

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Protecting our Infrastructure of Pipelines and Enhancing Safety Act of 2016'' or the ''PIPES Act of 2016''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

SEC. 2. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) GAS AND HAZARDOUS LIQUID.—Section 60125(a) of title 49, United States Code is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1) by striking ''there is authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Transportation for each of fiscal years 2012 through 2015, from fees collected under section 60301, $90,679,000, of which $4,746,000 is for carrying out such section 12 and $36,194,000 is for making grants.'' and inserting the following: ''there is authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Transportation from fees collected under section 60301—

''(A) $124,500,000 for fiscal year 2016, of which $9,000,000 shall be expended for carrying out such section 12 and $39,385,000 shall be expended for making grants;

''(B) $128,000,000 for fiscal year 2017 of which $9,000,000 shall be expended for carrying out such section 12 and $41,885,000 shall be expended for making grants;

''(C) $131,000,000 for fiscal year 2018, of which $9,000,000 shall be expended for carrying out such section 12 and $44,885,000 shall be expended for making grants; and

''(D) $134,000,000 for fiscal year 2019, of which $9,000,000 shall be expended for carrying out such section 12 and $47,885,000 shall be expended for making grants.'';

(2) in paragraph (2) by striking ''there is authorized to be appropriated for each of fiscal years 2012 through 2015 from the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund to carry out the provisions of this chapter related to hazardous liquid and section 12 of the Pipeline Safety Improvement Act of 2002 (49 U.S.C. 60101 note; Public Law 107–355), $18,573,000, of which $2,174,000 is for carrying out such section 12 and $4,558,000 is for making grants.'' and inserting the following: ''there is authorized to be appropriated from the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund to carry out the provisions of this chapter related to hazardous liquid and section 12 of the Pipeline Safety Improvement Act of 2002 (49 U.S.C. 60101 note; Public Law 107–355)—

''(A) $22,123,000 for fiscal year 2016, of which $3,000,000 shall be expended for carrying out such section 12 and $8,067,000 shall be expended for making grants;

''(B) $22,123,000 for fiscal year 2017, of which $3,000,000 shall be expended for carrying out such section 12 and $8,067,000 shall be expended for making grants;

''(C) $23,000,000 for fiscal year 2018, of which $3,000,000 shall be expended for carrying out such section 12 and $8,067,000 shall be expended for making grants; and

''(D) $23,000,000 for fiscal year 2019, of which $3,000,000 shall be expended for carrying out such section 12 and $8,067,000 shall be expended for making grants.''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(3) UNDERGROUND NATURAL GAS STORAGE FACILITY SAFETY ACCOUNT.—To carry out section 60141, there is authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Transportation from fees collected under section 60302 $8,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2017 through 2019.''.

(b) OPERATIONAL EXPENSES.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Transportation for the necessary operational expenses of the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration the following amounts:

(1) $21,000,000 for fiscal year 2016.
(2) $22,000,000 for fiscal year 2017.
(3) $22,000,000 for fiscal year 2018.
(4) $23,000,000 for fiscal year 2019.

(c) ONE-CALL NOTIFICATION PROGRAMS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 6107 of title 49, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''§ 6107. Funding

''Of the amounts made available under section 60125(a)(1), the Secretary shall expend $1,058,000 for each of fiscal years 2016 through 2019 to carry out section 6106.''.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The analysis for chapter 61 of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to section 6107 and inserting the following:

''6107. Funding.''.

(d) PIPELINE SAFETY INFORMATION GRANTS TO COMMUNITIES.—The first sentence of section 60130(c) of title 49, United States Code, is amended to read as follows: ''Of the amounts made available under section 2(b) of the PIPES Act of 2016, the Secretary shall expend $1,500,000 for each of fiscal years 2016 through 2019 to carry out this section.''

(e) PIPELINE INTEGRITY PROGRAM.—Section 12(f) of the Pipeline Safety Improvement Act of 2002 (49 U.S.C. 60101 note) is amended by striking ''2012 through 2015'' and inserting ''2016 through 2019''.

SEC. 3. REGULATORY UPDATES.

(a) PUBLICATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Transportation shall publish an update on a publicly available Web site of the Department of Transportation regarding the status of a final rule for each outstanding regulation, and upon such publication notify the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the

House of Representatives that such publication has been made.

(2) DEADLINES.—The Secretary shall publish an update under this subsection not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, and every 90 days thereafter until a final rule has been published in the Federal Register for each outstanding regulation.

(b) CONTENTS.—The Secretary shall include in each update published under subsection (a)—

(1) a description of the work plan for each outstanding regulation;

(2) an updated rulemaking timeline for each outstanding regulation;

(3) current staff allocations with respect to each outstanding regulation;

(4) any resource constraints affecting the rulemaking process for each outstanding regulation;

(5) any other details associated with the development of each outstanding regulation that affect the progress of the rulemaking process; and

(6) a description of all rulemakings regarding gas or hazardous liquid pipeline facilities published in the Federal Register that are not identified under subsection (c).

(c) OUTSTANDING REGULATION DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''outstanding regulation'' means—

(1) a final rule required under the Pipeline Safety, Regulatory Certainty, and Job Creation Act of 2011 (Public Law 112–90) that has not been published in the Federal Register; and

(2) a final rule regarding gas or hazardous liquid pipeline facilities required under this Act or an Act enacted prior to the date of enactment of this Act (other than the Pipeline Safety, Regulatory Certainty, and Job Creation Act of 2011 (Public Law 112–90)) that has not been published in the Federal Register.

SEC. 4. NATURAL GAS INTEGRITY MANAGEMENT REVIEW.

(a) REPORT.—Not later than 18 months after the date of publication in the Federal Register of a final rule regarding the safety of gas transmission pipelines related to the notice of proposed rulemaking issued on April 8, 2016, titled ''Pipeline Safety: Safety of Gas Transmission and Gathering Pipelines'' (81 Fed. Reg. 20721), the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report regarding the integrity management programs for gas pipeline facilities required under section 60109(c) of title 49, United States Code.

(b) CONTENTS.—The report required under subsection (a) shall include—

(1) an analysis of stakeholder perspectives, taking into consideration technical, operational, and economic feasibility, regarding ways to enhance pipeline facility safety, prevent inadvertent releases from pipeline facilities, and mitigate any adverse consequences of such inadvertent releases, including changes to the definition of high consequence area, or expanding integrity management beyond high consequence areas;

(2) a review of the types of benefits, including safety benefits, and estimated costs of the legacy class location regulations;

(3) an analysis of the impact pipeline facility features, including the age, condition, materials, and construction of a pipeline facility, have on safety and risk analysis of a particular pipeline facility;

(4) a description of any challenges affecting Federal or State regulators in the oversight of gas transmission pipeline facilities and how the challenges are being addressed; and

(5) a description of any challenges affecting the natural gas industry in complying with the programs, and how the challenges are being addressed, including any challenges faced by publicly owned natural gas distribution systems.

(c) DEFINITION OF HIGH CONSEQUENCE AREA.—In this section, the term ''high consequence area'' has the meaning given the term in section 192.903 of title 49, Code of Federal Regulations.

SEC. 5. HAZARDOUS LIQUID INTEGRITY MANAGEMENT REVIEW.

(a) REPORT.—Not later than 18 months after the date of publication in the Federal Register of a final rule regarding the safety of hazardous liquid pipeline facilities related to the notice of proposed rulemaking issued on October 13, 2015, titled ''Pipeline Safety: Safety of Hazardous Liquid Pipelines'' (80 Fed. Reg. 61610), the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report regarding the integrity management programs for hazardous liquid pipeline facilities, as regulated under sections 195.450 and 195.452 of title 49, Code of Federal Regulations.

(b) CONTENTS.—The report required under subsection (a) shall include—

(1) taking into consideration technical, operational, and economic feasibility, an analysis of stakeholder perspectives on—

(A) ways to enhance hazardous liquid pipeline facility safety;

(B) risk factors that may warrant more frequent inspections of hazardous liquid pipeline facilities; and

(C) changes to the definition of high consequence area;

(2) an analysis of how surveying, assessment, mitigation, and monitoring activities, including real-time hazardous liquid pipeline facility monitoring during significant flood events and information sharing with Federal agencies, are being used to address risks associated with rivers, flood plains, lakes, and coastal areas;

(3) an analysis of the impact pipeline facility features, including the age, condition, materials, and construction of a pipeline facility, have on safety and risk analysis of a particular pipeline facility and what changes to the definition of high consequence area could be made to improve pipeline facility safety; and

(4) a description of any challenges affecting Federal or State regulators in the oversight of hazardous liquid pipeline facilities and how those challenges are being addressed.

(c) DEFINITION OF HIGH CONSEQUENCE AREA.—In this section, the term ''high consequence area'' has the meaning given the term in section 195.450 of title 49, Code of Federal Regulations.

SEC. 6. TECHNICAL SAFETY STANDARDS COMMITTEES.

(a) APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS.—Section 60115(b)(4)(A) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking ''State commissioners. The Secretary shall consult with the national organization of State commissions before selecting those 2 individuals.'' and inserting ''State officials. The Secretary shall consult with national organizations representing State commissioners or utility regulators before making a selection under this subparagraph.''.

(b) VACANCIES.—Section 60115(b) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(5) Within 90 days of the date of enactment of the PIPES Act of 2016, the Secretary shall fill all vacancies on the Technical Pipeline Safety Standards Committee, the Technical Hazardous Liquid Pipeline Safety Standards Committee, and any other committee established pursuant to this section. After that period, the Secretary shall fill a vacancy on any such committee not later than 60 days after the vacancy occurs.''.

SEC. 7. INSPECTION REPORT INFORMATION.

(a) INSPECTION AND MAINTENANCE.—Section 60108 of title 49, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(e) IN GENERAL.—After the completion of a Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration pipeline safety inspection, the Administrator of such Administration, or the State authority certified under section 60105 of title 49, United States Code, to conduct such inspection, shall—

''(1) within 30 days, conduct a post-inspection briefing with the owner or operator of the gas or hazardous liquid pipeline facility inspected outlining any concerns; and

''(2) within 90 days, to the extent practicable, provide the owner or operator with written preliminary findings of the inspection.''.

(b) NOTIFICATION.—Not later than October 1, 2017, and each fiscal year thereafter for 2 years, the Administrator shall notify the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate of—

(1) the number of times a deadline under section 60108(e) of title 49, United States Code, was exceeded in the prior fiscal year; and

(2) in each instance, the length of time by which the deadline was exceeded.

SEC. 8. IMPROVING DAMAGE PREVENTION TECHNOLOGY.

(a) STUDY.—The Secretary of Transportation, in consultation with stakeholders, shall conduct a study on improving existing damage prevention programs through technological improvements in location, mapping, excavation, and communications practices to prevent excavation damage to a pipe or its coating, including considerations of technical, operational, and economic feasibility and existing damage prevention programs.

(b) CONTENTS.—The study under subsection (a) shall include—

(1) an identification of any methods to improve existing damage prevention programs through location and mapping practices or technologies in an effort to reduce releases caused by excavation;

(2) an analysis of how increased use of global positioning system digital mapping technologies, predictive analytic tools, public awareness initiatives including one-call initiatives, the use of mobile devices, and other advanced technologies could supplement existing one-call notification and damage prevention programs to reduce the frequency and severity of incidents caused by excavation damage;

(3) an identification of any methods to improve excavation practices or technologies in an effort to reduce pipeline damage;

(4) an analysis of the feasibility of a national data repository for pipeline excavation accident data that creates standardized data models for storing and sharing pipeline accident information; and

(5) an identification of opportunities for stakeholder engagement in preventing excavation damage.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on

Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives a report containing the results of the study conducted under subsection (a), including recommendations, that include the consideration of technical, operational, and economic feasibility, on how to incorporate into existing damage prevention programs technological improvements and practices that help prevent excavation damage.

SEC. 9. WORKFORCE MANAGEMENT.

(a) REVIEW.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Inspector General of the Department of Transportation shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate, a review of Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration staff resource management, including—

(1) geographic allocation plans, hiring and time-to-hire challenges, and expected retirement rates and recruitment and retention strategies;

(2) an identification and description of any previous periods of macroeconomic and pipeline industry conditions under which the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration has encountered difficulty in filling vacancies, and the degree to which special hiring authorities, including direct hiring authority authorized by the Office of Personnel Management, could have ameliorated such difficulty; and

(3) recommendations to address hiring challenges, training needs, and any other identified staff resource challenges.

(b) DIRECT HIRING.—Upon identification of a period described in subsection (a)(2), the Administrator of the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration may apply to the Office of Personnel Management for the authority to appoint qualified candidates to any position relating to pipeline safety, as determined by the Administrator, without regard to sections 3309 through 3319 of title 5, United States Code.

(c) SAVINGS CLAUSE.—Nothing in this section shall preclude the Administrator of the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration from applying to the Office of Personnel Management for the authority described in subsection (b) prior to the completion of the report required under subsection (a).

SEC. 10. INFORMATION-SHARING SYSTEM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Transportation shall convene a working group to consider the development of a voluntary information-sharing system to encourage collaborative efforts to improve inspection information feedback and information sharing with the purpose of improving gas transmission and hazardous liquid pipeline facility integrity risk analysis.

(b) MEMBERSHIP.—The working group convened pursuant to subsection (a) shall include representatives from—

(1) the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration;

(2) industry stakeholders, including operators of pipeline facilities, inspection technology, coating, and cathodic protection vendors, and pipeline inspection organizations;

(3) safety advocacy groups;

(4) research institutions;

(5) State public utility commissions or State officials responsible for pipeline safety oversight;

(6) State pipeline safety inspectors;

(7) labor representatives; and

(8) other entities, as determined appropriate by the Secretary.

(c) CONSIDERATIONS.—The working group convened pursuant to subsection (a) shall consider and provide recommendations to the Secretary on—

(1) the need for, and the identification of, a system to ensure that dig verification data are shared with in-line inspection operators to the extent consistent with the need to maintain proprietary and security-sensitive data in a confidential manner to improve pipeline safety and inspection technology;

(2) ways to encourage the exchange of pipeline inspection information and the development of advanced pipeline inspection technologies and enhanced risk analysis;

(3) opportunities to share data, including dig verification data between operators of pipeline facilities and in-line inspector vendors to expand knowledge of the advantages and disadvantages of the different types of in-line inspection technology and methodologies;

(4) options to create a secure system that protects proprietary data while encouraging the exchange of pipeline inspection information and the development of advanced pipeline inspection technologies and enhanced risk analysis;

(5) means and best practices for the protection of safety- and security-sensitive information and proprietary information; and

(6) regulatory, funding, and legal barriers to sharing the information described in paragraphs (1) through (4).

(d) PUBLICATION.—The Secretary shall publish the recommendations provided under subsection (c) on a publicly available Web site of the Department of Transportation.

SEC. 11. NATIONWIDE INTEGRATED PIPELINE SAFETY REGULATORY DATABASE.

(a) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Transportation shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report on the feasibility of establishing a national integrated pipeline safety regulatory inspection database to improve communication and collaboration between the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration and State pipeline regulators.

(b) CONTENTS.—The report submitted under subsection (a) shall include—

(1) a description of any efforts underway to test a secure information-sharing system for the purpose described in subsection (a);

(2) a description of any progress in establishing common standards for maintaining, collecting, and presenting pipeline safety regulatory inspection data, and a methodology for sharing the data;

(3) a description of any inadequacies or gaps in State and Federal inspection, enforcement, geospatial, or other pipeline safety regulatory inspection data;

(4) a description of the potential safety benefits of a national integrated pipeline safety regulatory inspection database; and

(5) recommendations, including those of stakeholders for how to implement a secure information-sharing system that protects proprietary and security sensitive information and data for the purpose described in subsection (a).

(c) CONSULTATION.—In implementing this section, the Secretary shall consult with stakeholders, including each State authority operating under a certification to regulate intrastate pipelines under section 60105 of title 49, United States Code.

(d) ESTABLISHMENT OF DATABASE.—The Secretary may establish, if appropriate, a national integrated pipeline safety regulatory database—

(1) after submission of the report required under subsection (a); or

(2) upon notification to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate of the need to establish such database prior to the submission of the report under subsection (a).

SEC. 12. UNDERGROUND GAS STORAGE FACILITIES.

(a) DEFINED TERM.—Section 60101(a) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (21)(B) by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in paragraph (22)(B)(iii) by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon;

(3) in paragraph (24) by striking ''and'' at the end;

(4) in paragraph (25) by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(5) by adding at the end the following:

''(26) 'underground natural gas storage facility' means a gas pipeline facility that stores natural gas in an underground facility, including—

''(A) a depleted hydrocarbon reservoir;

''(B) an aquifer reservoir; or

''(C) a solution-mined salt cavern reservoir.''.

(b) STANDARDS FOR UNDERGROUND GAS STORAGE FACILITIES.—Chapter 601 of title 49, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''§ 60141. Standards for underground natural gas storage facilities

''(a) MINIMUM SAFETY STANDARDS.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of the PIPES Act of 2016, the Secretary, in consultation with the heads of other relevant Federal agencies, shall issue minimum safety standards for underground natural gas storage facilities.

''(b) CONSIDERATIONS.—In developing the safety standards required under subsection (a), the Secretary shall, to the extent practicable—

''(1) consider consensus standards for the operation, environmental protection, and integrity management of underground natural gas storage facilities;

''(2) consider the economic impacts of the regulations on individual gas customers;

''(3) ensure that the regulations do not have a significant economic impact on end users; and

''(4) consider the recommendations of the Aliso Canyon natural gas leak task force established under section 31 of the PIPES Act of 2016.

''(c) FEDERAL-STATE COOPERATION.—The Secretary may authorize a State authority (including a municipality) to participate in the oversight of underground natural gas storage facilities in the same manner as provided in sections 60105 and 60106.

''(d) RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Nothing in this section may be construed to affect any Federal regulation relating to gas pipeline facilities that is in effect on the day before the date of enactment of the PIPES Act of 2016.

''(2) LIMITATIONS.—Nothing in this section may be construed to authorize the Secretary—

''(A) to prescribe the location of an underground natural gas storage facility; or

''(B) to require the Secretary's permission to construct a facility referred to in subparagraph (A).

''(e) PREEMPTION.—A State authority may adopt additional or more stringent safety standards for intrastate underground natural gas storage facilities if such standards are

compatible with the minimum standards prescribed under this section.

''(f) STATUTORY CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to affect the Secretary's authority under this title to regulate the underground storage of gas that is not natural gas.''.

(c) USER FEES.—Chapter 603 of title 49, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 60301 the following:

''§ 60302. User fees for underground natural gas storage facilities

''(a) IN GENERAL.—A fee shall be imposed on an entity operating an underground natural gas storage facility subject to section 60141. Any such fee imposed shall be collected before the end of the fiscal year to which it applies.

''(b) MEANS OF COLLECTION.—The Secretary of Transportation shall prescribe procedures to collect fees under this section. The Secretary may use a department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States Government or of a State or local government to collect the fee and may reimburse the department, agency, or instrumentality a reasonable amount for its services.

''(c) USE OF FEES.—

''(1) ACCOUNT.—There is established an Underground Natural Gas Storage Facility Safety Account in the Pipeline Safety Fund established in the Treasury of the United States under section 60301.

''(2) USE OF FEES.—A fee collected under this section—

''(A) shall be deposited in the Underground Natural Gas Storage Facility Safety Account; and

''(B) if the fee is related to an underground natural gas storage facility subject to section 60141, the amount of the fee may be used only for an activity related to underground natural gas storage facility safety.

''(3) LIMITATION.—No fee may be collected under this section, except to the extent that the expenditure of such fee to pay the costs of an activity related to underground natural gas storage facility safety for which such fee is imposed is provided in advance in an appropriations Act.''.

(d) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—

(1) CHAPTER 601.—The table of sections for chapter 601 of title 49, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''60141. Standards for underground natural gas storage facilities.''.

(2) CHAPTER 603.—The table of sections for chapter 603 of title 49, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 60301 the following:

''60302. User fees for underground natural gas storage facilities.''.

SEC. 13. JOINT INSPECTION AND OVERSIGHT.

Section 60106 of title 49, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(f) JOINT INSPECTORS.—At the request of a State authority, the Secretary shall allow for a certified State authority under section 60105 to participate in the inspection of an interstate pipeline facility.''.

SEC. 14. SAFETY DATA SHEETS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Each owner or operator of a hazardous liquid pipeline facility, following an accident involving such pipeline facility that results in a hazardous liquid spill, shall provide safety data sheets on any spilled hazardous liquid to the designated Federal On-Scene Coordinator and appropriate State and local emergency responders within 6 hours of a telephonic or electronic notice of the accident to the National Response Center.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) FEDERAL ON-SCENE COORDINATOR.—The term ''Federal On-Scene Coordinator'' has the meaning given such term in section 311(a) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1321(a)).

(2) NATIONAL RESPONSE CENTER.—The term ''National Response Center'' means the center described under section 300.125(a) of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations.

(3) SAFETY DATA SHEET.—The term ''safety data sheet'' means a safety data sheet required under section 1910.1200 of title 29, Code of Federal Regulations.

SEC. 15. HAZARDOUS MATERIALS IDENTIFICATION NUMBERS.

Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Transportation shall issue an advanced notice of proposed rulemaking to take public comment on the petition for rulemaking dated October 28, 2015, titled ''Corrections to Title 49 C.F.R. §172.336 Identification numbers; special provisions'' (P–1667).

SEC. 16. EMERGENCY ORDER AUTHORITY.

Section 60117 of title 49, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(o) EMERGENCY ORDER AUTHORITY.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—If the Secretary determines that an unsafe condition or practice, or a combination of unsafe conditions and practices, constitutes or is causing an imminent hazard, the Secretary may issue an emergency order described in paragraph (3) imposing emergency restrictions, prohibitions, and safety measures on owners and operators of gas or hazardous liquid pipeline facilities without prior notice or an opportunity for a hearing, but only to the extent necessary to abate the imminent hazard.

''(2) CONSIDERATIONS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Before issuing an emergency order under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall consider, as appropriate, the following factors:

''(i) The impact of the emergency order on public health and safety.

''(ii) The impact, if any, of the emergency order on the national or regional economy or national security.

''(iii) The impact of the emergency order on the ability of owners and operators of pipeline facilities to maintain reliability and continuity of service to customers.

''(B) CONSULTATION.—In considering the factors under subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall consult, as the Secretary determines appropriate, with appropriate Federal agencies, State agencies, and other entities knowledgeable in pipeline safety or operations.

''(3) WRITTEN ORDER.—An emergency order issued by the Secretary pursuant to paragraph (1) with respect to an imminent hazard shall contain a written description of—

''(A) the violation, condition, or practice that constitutes or is causing the imminent hazard;

''(B) the entities subject to the order;

''(C) the restrictions, prohibitions, or safety measures imposed;

''(D) the standards and procedures for obtaining relief from the order;

''(E) how the order is tailored to abate the imminent hazard and the reasons the authorities under section 60112 and 60117(l) are insufficient to do so; and

''(F) how the considerations were taken into account pursuant to paragraph (2).

''(4) OPPORTUNITY FOR REVIEW.—Upon receipt of a petition for review from an entity subject to, and aggrieved by, an emergency order issued under this subsection, the Secretary shall provide an opportunity for a review of the order under section 554 of title 5 to determine whether the order should remain in effect, be modified, or be terminated.

''(5) EXPIRATION OF EFFECTIVENESS ORDER.—If a petition for review of an emergency order is filed under paragraph (4) and an agency decision with respect to the petition is not issued on or before the last day of the 30-day period beginning on the date on which the petition is filed, the order shall cease to be effective on such day, unless the Secretary determines in writing on or before the last day of such period that the imminent hazard still exists.

''(6) JUDICIAL REVIEW OF ORDERS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—After completion of the review process described in paragraph (4), or the issuance of a written determination by the Secretary pursuant to paragraph (5), an entity subject to, and aggrieved by, an emergency order issued under this subsection may seek judicial review of the order in a district court of the United States and shall be given expedited consideration.

''(B) LIMITATION.—The filing of a petition for review under subparagraph (A) shall not stay or modify the force and effect of the agency's final decision under paragraph (4), or the written determination under paragraph (5), unless stayed or modified by the Secretary.

''(7) REGULATIONS.—

''(A) TEMPORARY REGULATIONS.—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of the PIPES Act of 2016, the Secretary shall issue such temporary regulations as are necessary to carry out this subsection. The temporary regulations shall expire on the date of issuance of the final regulations required under subparagraph (B).

''(B) FINAL REGULATIONS.—Not later than 270 days after such date of enactment, the Secretary shall issue such regulations as are necessary to carry out this subsection. Such regulations shall ensure that the review process described in paragraph (4) contains the same procedures as subsections (d) and (g) of section 109.19 of title 49, Code of Federal Regulations, and is otherwise consistent with the review process developed under such section, to the greatest extent practicable and not inconsistent with this section.

''(8) IMMINENT HAZARD DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term 'imminent hazard' means the existence of a condition relating to a gas or hazardous liquid pipeline facility that presents a substantial likelihood that death, serious illness, severe personal injury, or a substantial endangerment to health, property, or the environment may occur before the reasonably foreseeable completion date of a formal proceeding begun to lessen the risk of such death, illness, injury, or endangerment.

''(9) LIMITATION AND SAVINGS CLAUSE.—An emergency order issued under this subsection may not be construed to—

''(A) alter, amend, or limit the Secretary's obligations under, or the applicability of, section 553 of title 5; or

''(B) provide the authority to amend the Code of Federal Regulations.''.

SEC. 17. STATE GRANT FUNDS.

Section 60107 of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following:

''(b) PAYMENTS.—After notifying and consulting with a State authority, the Secretary may withhold any part of a payment when the Secretary decides that the authority is not carrying out satisfactorily a safety program or not acting satisfactorily as an agent. The Secretary may pay an authority under this section only when the authority ensures the Secretary that it will provide the remaining costs of a safety program, except when the Secretary waives this requirement.''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(e) REPURPOSING OF FUNDS.—If a State program's certification is rejected under section 60105(f) or such program is otherwise

suspended or interrupted, the Secretary may use any undistributed, deobligated, or recovered funds authorized under this section to carry out pipeline safety activities for that State within the period of availability for such funds.''.

SEC. 18. RESPONSE PLANS.

Each owner or operator of a hazardous liquid pipeline facility required to prepare a response plan pursuant to part 194 of title 49, Code of Federal Regulations, shall—

(1) consider the impact of a discharge into or on navigable waters or adjoining shorelines, including those that may be covered in whole or in part by ice; and

(2) include procedures and resources for responding to such discharge in the plan.

SEC. 19. UNUSUALLY SENSITIVE AREAS.

(a) AREAS TO BE INCLUDED AS UNUSUALLY SENSITIVE.—Section 60109(b)(2) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking ''have been identified as'' and inserting ''are part of the Great Lakes or have been identified as coastal beaches, marine coastal waters,''.

(b) UNUSUALLY SENSITIVE AREAS (USA) ECOLOGICAL RESOURCES.—The Secretary of Transportation shall revise section 195.6(b) of title 49, Code of Federal Regulations, to explicitly state that the Great Lakes, coastal beaches, and marine coastal waters are USA ecological resources for purposes of determining whether a pipeline is in a high consequence area (as defined in section 195.450 of such title).

SEC. 20. PIPELINE SAFETY TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE GRANTS.

(a) PUBLIC PARTICIPATION LIMITATION.—Section 60130(a)(4) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by inserting ''on technical pipeline safety issues'' after ''public participation''.

(b) AUDIT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Inspector General of the Department of Transportation shall submit to the Secretary of Transportation, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report evaluating the grant program under section 60130 of title 49, United States Code. The report shall include—

(1) a list of the recipients of all grant funds during fiscal years 2010 through 2015;

(2) a description of how each grant was used;

(3) an analysis of the compliance with the terms of grant agreements, including subsections (a) and (b) of such section;

(4) an evaluation of the competitive process used to award the grant funds; and

(5) an evaluation of—

(A) the ability of the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration to oversee grant funds and usage; and

(B) the procedures used for such oversight.

SEC. 21. STUDY OF MATERIALS AND CORROSION PREVENTION IN PIPELINE TRANSPORTATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a study on materials, training, and corrosion prevention technologies for gas and hazardous liquid pipeline facilities.

(b) REQUIREMENTS.—The study required under subsection (a) shall include—

(1) an analysis of—

(A) the range of piping materials, including plastic materials, used to transport hazardous liquids and natural gas in the United States and in other developed countries around the world;

(B) the types of technologies used for corrosion prevention, including coatings and cathodic protection;

(C) common causes of corrosion, including interior and exterior moisture buildup and impacts of moisture buildup under insulation; and

(D) the training provided to personnel responsible for identifying and preventing corrosion in pipelines, and for repairing such pipelines;

(2) the extent to which best practices or guidance relating to pipeline facility design, installation, operation, and maintenance, including training, are available to recognize or prevent corrosion;

(3) an analysis of the estimated costs and anticipated benefits, including safety benefits, associated with the use of such materials and technologies; and

(4) stakeholder and expert perspectives on the effectiveness of corrosion control techniques to reduce the incidence of corrosion-related pipeline failures.

SEC. 22. RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Inspector General of the Department of Transportation shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report regarding the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration's research and development program carried out under section 12 of the Pipeline Safety Improvement Act of 2002 (49 U.S.C. 60101 note). The report shall include an evaluation of—

(1) compliance with the consultation requirement under subsection (d)(2) of such section;

(2) the extent to which the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration enters into joint research ventures with Federal and non-Federal entities, and benefits thereof;

(3) the policies and procedures the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration has put in place to ensure there are no conflicts of interest with administering grants pursuant to the program, and whether those policies and procedures are being followed; and

(4) an evaluation of the outcomes of research conducted with Federal and non-Federal entities and the degree to which such outcomes have been adopted or utilized.

(b) COLLABORATIVE SAFETY RESEARCH REPORT.—

(1) BIENNIAL REPORTS.—Section 60124(a)(6) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(C) a summary of each research and development project carried out with Federal and non-Federal entities pursuant to section 12 of the Pipeline Safety Improvement Act of 2002 and a review of how the project affects safety.''.

(2) PIPELINE SAFETY IMPROVEMENT ACT.—Section 12 of the Pipeline Safety Improvement Act of 2002 (49 U.S.C. 60101 note) is amended—

(A) by striking subsection (d)(3)(C) and inserting the following:

''(C) FUNDING FROM NON-FEDERAL SOURCES.—The Secretary shall ensure that—

''(i) at least 30 percent of the costs of technology research and development activities may be carried out using non-Federal sources;

''(ii) at least 20 percent of the costs of basic research and development with universities may be carried out using non-Federal sources; and

''(iii) up to 100 percent of the costs of research and development for purely governmental purposes may be carried out using Federal funds.''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''(h) INDEPENDENT EXPERTS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of the PIPES Act of 2016, the Secretary shall—

''(1) implement processes and procedures to ensure that activities listed under subsection (c), to the greatest extent practicable, produce results that are peer-reviewed by independent experts and not by persons or entities that have a financial interest in the pipeline, petroleum, or natural gas industries, or that would be directly impacted by the results of the projects; and

''(2) submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report describing the processes and procedures implemented under paragraph (1).

''(i) CONFLICT OF INTEREST.—The Secretary shall take all practical steps to ensure that each recipient of an agreement under this section discloses in writing to the Secretary any conflict of interest on a research and development project carried out under this section, and includes any such disclosure as part of the final deliverable pursuant to such agreement. The Secretary may not make an award under this section directly to a pipeline owner or operator that is regulated by the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration or a State-certified regulatory authority if there is a conflict of interest relating to such owner or operator.''.

SEC. 23. ACTIVE AND ABANDONED PIPELINES.

Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Transportation shall issue an advisory bulletin to owners and operators of gas or hazardous liquid pipeline facilities and Federal and State pipeline safety personnel regarding procedures of the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration required to change the status of a pipeline facility from active to abandoned, including specific guidance on the terms recognized by the Secretary for each pipeline status referred to in such advisory bulletin.

SEC. 24. STATE PIPELINE SAFETY AGREEMENTS.

(a) STUDY.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall complete a study on State pipeline safety agreements made pursuant to section 60106 of title 49, United States Code. Such study shall consider the following:

(1) The integration of Federal and State or local authorities in carrying out activities pursuant to an agreement under such section.

(2) The estimated staff and other resources used by Federal and State authorities in carrying out inspection activities pursuant to agreements under such section.

(3) The estimated staff and other resources used by the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration in carrying out interstate inspections in areas where there is no interstate agreement with a State pursuant to such section.

(b) NOTICE REQUIREMENT FOR DENIAL.—Section 60106(b) of title 49, United States Code,

is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(4) NOTICE UPON DENIAL.—If a State authority requests an interstate agreement under this section and the Secretary denies such request, the Secretary shall provide written notification to the State authority of the denial that includes an explanation of the reasons for such denial.''.

SEC. 25. REQUIREMENTS FOR CERTAIN HAZARDOUS LIQUID PIPELINE FACILITIES.

Section 60109 of title 49, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(g) HAZARDOUS LIQUID PIPELINE FACILITIES.—

''(1) INTEGRITY ASSESSMENTS.—Notwithstanding any pipeline integrity management program or integrity assessment schedule otherwise required by the Secretary, each operator of a pipeline facility to which this subsection applies shall ensure that pipeline integrity assessments—

''(A) using internal inspection technology appropriate for the integrity threat are completed not less often than once every 12 months; and

''(B) using pipeline route surveys, depth of cover surveys, pressure tests, external corrosion direct assessment, or other technology that the operator demonstrates can further the understanding of the condition of the pipeline facility are completed on a schedule based on the risk that the pipeline facility poses to the high consequence area in which the pipeline facility is located.

''(2) APPLICATION.—This subsection shall apply to any underwater hazardous liquid pipeline facility located in a high consequence area—

''(A) that is not an offshore pipeline facility; and

''(B) any portion of which is located at depths greater than 150 feet under the surface of the water.

''(3) HIGH CONSEQUENCE AREA DEFINED.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'high consequence area' has the meaning given that term in section 195.450 of title 49, Code of Federal Regulations.

''(4) INSPECTION AND ENFORCEMENT.—The Secretary shall conduct inspections under section 60117(c) to determine whether each operator of a pipeline facility to which this subsection applies is complying with this section.''.

SEC. 26. STUDY ON PROPANE GAS PIPELINE FACILITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Transportation shall enter into an agreement with the Transportation Research Board of the National Academies to conduct a study examining the safety, regulatory requirements, techniques, and best practices applicable to pipeline facilities that transport or store only petroleum gas or mixtures of petroleum gas and air to 100 or fewer customers, in accordance with the requirements of this section.

(b) REQUIREMENTS.—In conducting the study pursuant to subsection (a), the Transportation Research Board shall analyze—

(1) Federal, State, and local regulatory requirements applicable to pipeline facilities described in subsection (a);

(2) techniques and best practices relating to the design, installation, operation, and maintenance of such pipeline facilities; and

(3) the costs and benefits, including safety benefits, associated with such applicable regulatory requirements and the use of such techniques and best practices.

(c) PARTICIPATION.—In conducting the study pursuant to subsection (a), the Transportation Research Board shall consult with Federal, State, and local governments, private sector entities, and consumer and pipeline safety advocates, as appropriate.

(d) DEADLINE.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate the results of the study conducted pursuant to subsection (a) and any recommendations for improving the safety of such pipeline facilities.

(e) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ''petroleum gas'' has the meaning given that term in section 192.3 of title 49, Code of Federal Regulations, as in effect on the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 27. STANDARDS FOR CERTAIN LIQUEFIED NATURAL GAS PIPELINE FACILITIES.

(a) NATIONAL SECURITY.—Section 60103(a) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (5), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in paragraph (6), by striking the period and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (6) the following:

''(7) national security.''.

(b) UPDATE TO MINIMUM SAFETY STANDARDS.—The Secretary of Transportation shall review and update the minimum safety standards prescribed pursuant to section 60103 of title 49, United States Code, for permanent, small scale liquefied natural gas pipeline facilities.

(c) SAVINGS CLAUSE.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to limit the Secretary's authority under chapter 601 of title 49, United States Code, to regulate liquefied natural gas pipeline facilities.

SEC. 28. PIPELINE ODORIZATION STUDY.

Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit a report to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives that assesses—

(1) the feasibility, costs, and benefits of odorizing all combustible gas in pipeline transportation; and

(2) the affects of the odorization of all combustible gas in pipeline transportation on—

(A) manufacturers, agriculture, and other end users; and

(B) public health and safety.

SEC. 29. REPORT ON NATURAL GAS LEAK REPORTING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration shall submit to Congress a report on the metrics provided to the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration and other Federal and State agencies related to lost and unaccounted for natural gas from distribution pipelines and systems.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The report required under subsection (a) shall include the following elements:

(1) An examination of different reporting requirements or standards for lost and unaccounted for natural gas to different agencies, the reasons for any such discrepancies, and recommendations for harmonizing and improving the accuracy of reporting.

(2) An analysis of whether separate or alternative reporting could better measure the amounts and identify the location of lost and unaccounted for natural gas from natural gas distribution systems.

(3) A description of potential safety issues associated with natural gas that is lost and unaccounted for from natural gas distribution systems.

(4) An assessment of whether alternate reporting and measures will resolve any safety issues identified under paragraph (3), including an analysis of the potential impact, including potential savings, on rate payers and end users of natural gas products of such reporting and measures.

(c) CONSIDERATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS.—If the Administrator determines that alternate reporting structures or recommendations included in the report required under subsection (a) would significantly improve the reporting and measurement of lost and unaccounted for gas and safety of natural gas distribution systems, the Administrator shall, not later than 1 year after making such determination, issue regulations, as the Administrator determines appropriate, to implement the recommendations.

SEC. 30. REVIEW OF STATE POLICIES RELATING TO NATURAL GAS LEAKS.

(a) REVIEW.—The Administrator of the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration shall conduct a State-by-State review of State-level policies that—

(1) encourage the repair and replacement of leaking natural gas distribution pipelines or systems that pose a safety threat, such as timelines to repair leaks and limits on cost recovery from ratepayers; and

(2) may create barriers for entities to conduct work to repair and replace leaking natural gas pipelines or distribution systems.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report containing the findings of the review conducted under subsection (a) and recommendations on Federal or State policies or best practices to improve safety by accelerating the repair and replacement of natural gas pipelines or systems that are leaking or releasing natural gas. The report shall consider the potential impact, including potential savings, of the implementation of such recommendations on ratepayers or end users of the natural gas pipeline system.

(c) IMPLEMENTATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS.—If the Administrator determines that the recommendations made under subsection (b) would significantly improve pipeline safety, the Administrator shall, not later than 1 year after making such determination, and in coordination with the heads of other relevant agencies as appropriate, issue regulations, as the Administrator determines appropriate, to implement the recommendations.

SEC. 31. ALISO CANYON NATURAL GAS LEAK TASK FORCE.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF TASK FORCE.—Not later than 15 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Energy shall lead and establish an Aliso Canyon natural gas leak task force.

(b) MEMBERSHIP OF TASK FORCE.—In addition to the Secretary, the task force established under subsection (a) shall be composed of—

(1) 1 representative from the Department of Transportation;

(2) 1 representative from the Department of Health and Human Services;

(3) 1 representative from the Environmental Protection Agency;

(4) 1 representative from the Department of the Interior;

(5) 1 representative from the Department of Commerce;

(6) 1 representative from the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission; and

(7) representatives of State and local governments, as determined appropriate by the Secretary and the Administrator.

(c) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the task force established under subsection (a) shall submit a final report that contains the information described in paragraph (2) to—

(A) the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate;

(B) the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives;

(C) the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate;

(D) the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives;

(E) the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate;

(F) the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives;

(G) the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate;

(H) the Committee on Education and the Workforce of the House of Representatives;

(I) the President; and

(J) relevant Federal and State agencies.

(2) INFORMATION INCLUDED.—The report submitted under paragraph (1) shall include—

(A) an analysis and conclusion of the cause and contributing factors of the Aliso Canyon natural gas leak;

(B) an analysis of measures taken to stop the natural gas leak, with an immediate focus on other, more effective measures that could be taken;

(C) an assessment of the impact of the natural gas leak on—

(i) health, safety, and the environment;

(ii) wholesale and retail electricity prices; and

(iii) the reliability of the bulk-power system;

(D) an analysis of how Federal, State, and local agencies responded to the natural gas leak;

(E) in order to lessen the negative impacts of leaks from underground natural gas storage facilities, recommendations on how to improve—

(i) the response to a future leak; and

(ii) coordination between all appropriate Federal, State, and local agencies in the response to the Aliso Canyon natural gas leak and future natural gas leaks;

(F) an analysis of the potential for a similar natural gas leak to occur at other underground natural gas storage facilities in the United States;

(G) recommendations on how to prevent any future natural gas leaks;

(H) recommendations regarding Aliso Canyon and other underground natural gas storage facilities located in close proximity to residential populations;

(I) any recommendations on information that is not currently collected but that would be in the public interest to collect and distribute to agencies and institutions for the continued study and monitoring of natural gas storage infrastructure in the United States; and

(J) any other recommendations, as appropriate.

(3) PUBLICATION.—The final report under paragraph (1) shall be made available to the public in an electronically accessible format.

(4) FINDINGS.—If, before the final report is submitted under paragraph (1), the task force established under subsection (a) finds methods to solve the natural gas leak at Aliso Canyon, finds methods to better protect the affected communities, or finds methods to help prevent other leaks, the task force shall immediately submit such findings to the entities described in subparagraphs (A) through (J) of paragraph (1).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. DENHAM) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CAPUANO) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on S. 2276, as amended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thank the Chair for the time to express my support for the Protecting our Infrastructure of Pipelines and Enhancing Safety Act of 2016. This is the PIPES Act of 2016.

The United States has the largest network of energy pipelines in the world—over 2.6 million miles of pipe. Pipelines are a critical part of our energy infrastructure, with over 64 percent of our energy being transported by our pipes within this country. The sustained oversight of the Department of Transportation's pipeline safety programs is critical for pipelines to continue to safely transport our energy products.

This bill was developed in a bipartisan manner over the past several years. My subcommittee held a number of hearings and roundtables to hear from stakeholders on the need for reauthorization. On April 20, the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee unanimously approved our bill. Similarly, the Energy and Commerce Committee, with which we share jurisdiction, passed its version on April 27. Since then, both House committees have worked on a bipartisan basis to meld this version with the Senate's version, which passed last December. This collaborative, constructive process has resulted in the bill we are considering today, which we believe is a solid safety improvement.

First, we require PHMSA to set minimum Federal standards for underground natural gas storage facilities—a critical issue for my home State of California after the Aliso Canyon leak.

We make sure PHMSA is focused on finishing outstanding issues from the last reauthorization by requiring PHMSA to update Congress every 90 days on its progress.

The bill also authorizes emergency order authority for the pipeline sector but with important preorder requirements to make sure, if the DOT uses such authority, it does it right.

This legislation promotes the better use of data and technology to improve safety, including studying the latest innovations in pipeline materials and corrosion prevention.

Ultimately, our goal is to make sure that we have the safest pipeline network in the world.

We have worked in a bipartisan, bicameral manner to develop this bill. I believe that this bill will improve the safety of our pipeline infrastructure.

I thank Messrs. CAPUANO, SHUSTER, and DEFAZIO for their work on this bill. I also thank Energy and Commerce Committee Chairman UPTON, who has worked tirelessly on this with Ranking Member PALLONE. Lastly, I thank the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, & Transportation for its hard work. Together, we have made a great bill that will create a safer infrastructure for our pipelines.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As you have just heard, this is a great piece of legislation. This is exactly the way that Congress is supposed to work. We had our differences, but we worked them out because everybody gave a little bit to get to the middle—to get something good for America. This is the kind of bill that, on an average day, will not get any of us elected or unelected, but it is something that is good for the safety of America on pipelines and hazardous materials.

I would like to point out just a few items that, I think, are particularly important:

For the first time, we have added an emergency order authority so that our regulators, when there is a problem, can quickly address it as opposed to having to wait around and let it burn out on its own;

We added some provisions in there to boost funding to the States and the localities so that they can train their own people on how to deal with these things, because they are, after all, the first responders;

We added some information relative to oil spill response plans. For me, I thought it was very important that we added a section that makes sure that there are no conflicts of interest on the studies done by PHMSA, on which we rely.

There are many other provisions in this bill that are deserving of our support—as always, like with any bill. Any one of us can point out things that we don't like or that we wanted more on, but that is what compromise is all about. I am proud to be here again with another bill that comes out of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and for the traditional way that we have worked for many, many years in a bipartisan way.

I thank Messrs. DENHAM, SHUSTER, and DEFAZIO, all of the members of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee and the members of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

This particular bill is more difficult than usual because there were two committees involved. It makes four different sides and eight different sides on the House, plus the Senate; yet we did it in a reasonable fashion and in a relatively quick way. It proves the system can work when you have people at the table who want it to work.

I thank everybody who has been involved with this, and I look forward to the passage of the bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN).

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to support this legislation today and to commend the committees for their work on pipeline safety and pipeline safety improvement. I also have to take this opportunity, because the committee has done very good work on the FAST Act, to talk about rail safety.

This rail accident occurred over the weekend just 7 miles from my home in the national scenic area of the Columbia River Gorge. I was there not long after it happened. I met with the incident commanders. I met with the fire chief. I met with city officials and county officials. Let me just say that, while you are protecting pipelines—and that is really important—we need to continue to make progress on rail safety and to make sure that the new cars that were ordered by this Congress get put into service, especially in these critical waterway areas, as soon as possible. We need to make sure that track improvements are required—that new fasteners are used to deal with issues where, in this case, perhaps, it is a track separation issue. We need to make sure that our first responders get all of the training and that the Department of Transportation finishes its work on its rule for spill response and for safety.

This is a critically important issue for the people I represent on both the Oregon and Washington sides of the Columbia River because these trains are going through, and we are having these kinds of situations. We need to make sure we have the most up-to-date safety, the most up-to-date training, and the safest cars and tracks possible. We are going to stay on this until that happens.

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE), the ranking member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. PALLONE. I thank my friend from Massachusetts.

Mr. Speaker, I want to echo what Mr. CAPUANO said about the bipartisan nature of this bill and in our working together between the two committees to achieve success.

The vast network of energy pipelines in this country is essentially out of sight, out of mind for most Americans, but when something goes wrong, these facilities can make themselves known in devastating and sometimes deadly ways.

This is something that both Representative CAPPS and Representative SHERMAN, unfortunately, have experienced since the start of this Congress. My own district experienced the devastation of a pipeline failure in 1994 when a pipeline exploded in Edison, New Jersey, and destroyed about 300 homes. Ever since then, I have sought to make our Nation's pipelines safer by making the law and its regulator stronger.

The legislation before us, while not the bill that maybe we would have written, as Mr. CAPUANO said, is a good proposal that moves the ball forward on safety. It is the result of a number of weeks of bipartisan, bicameral negotiations. While some compromises were made, this is a product that in many ways is greater than the sum of its parts. I am particularly pleased that it includes versions of important provisions that were authored by a number of Energy and Power Subcommittee members, including Mrs. CAPPS, Messrs. GREEN, ENGEL, MCNERNEY, and WELCH, and Ranking Member BOBBY RUSH.

In particular, the House amendment gives the Secretary of Transportation, for the first time ever, emergency order authority to address the threats to public health, safety, and the environment that are posed by dangerous pipelines on a comprehensive, industrywide basis. It also changes the existing pipeline safety information grant program, which helps ensure adequate funding of pipeline safety technical assistance grants to communities and nonprofit organizations. I am pleased that the legislation improves the protection of coastal beaches and marine coastal waters—areas that are vital to my district and to the districts of many others—by explicitly designating them as areas that are unusually sensitive to the environmental damage that is caused by pipeline failures. It also contains a provision that establishes a program for regulating underground natural gas storage facilities.

I urge the passage of the bill.

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON), the full committee chair of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, pipeline safety is especially personal for me. Back in 2010, we experienced a bad spill just outside of my district in southwest Michigan that impacted the Kalamazoo River. Ask anyone who was directly affected. Seeing the aftermath firsthand smacks the senses and leaves a lasting impression. While a spill can happen in an instant, the damage can take decades and, in fact, more than $1 billion to fix. Underscoring the need for strong safety laws is what this bill does.

Congress asked the Department of Transportation's Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration—that is PHMSA for short—to develop and enforce pipeline safety regulations. PHMSA doesn't do the job by itself. It relies heavily on partnerships with States and local governments to inspect the pipelines and, yes, to enforce the law; but the reality is that more can be done to prevent accidents from occurring and to mitigate spills when the unthinkable happens.

□ 1730

The amendment to the Senate bill before us today, this bill, incorporates texts from two House bills, which were both approved unanimously in committee: H.R. 5050, the Pipeline Safety Act, which passed the Committee on Energy and Commerce; and H.R. 4937, the PIPES Act of 2016, which passed the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee.

This important legislation will reauthorize PHMSA's pipeline safety through 2019, press PHMSA to complete overdue safety regs, and impose additional new safety requirements for pipeline operators.

I have often said that pipelines should be subject to greater scrutiny and more frequent inspections, and those that cross the Straits of Mackinac are a perfect example. The Straits of Mackinac is a narrow waterway that separates Michigan's two peninsulas. It connects Lake Michigan and Lake Huron. The exceptionally strong and complex currents hundreds of feet deep make this area tremendously sensitive. If a spill were to occur, the consequences would be unthinkable.

Our solution improves protections for the Great Lakes and other areas around the country where the threat of a spill poses the greatest risk to public safety and the environment. It also requires pipeline operators to consider a worst-case discharge into icy waters and conduct more frequent and transparent and, in some cases, annual inspections of deep underwater crossings. This bill does that.

We also update and improve PHMSA's pipeline safety program in a number of other ways by closing the gaps in Federal standards for underground natural gas storage and liquefied natural gas facilities. It promotes better use of data and technology and improves communication with pipeline operators to incorporate the lessons learned from past incidents.

We promised action, and today that is what this bill does. I am proud of the bipartisan agreement that will make a real difference. I am proud of the relationship that our committee has with Chairman SHUSTER and the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee and all the good work that everyone has done—Mr. PALLONE, Mr. RUSH, and our colleagues in the Senate. This is a bipartisan bill. Let's get 'er done.

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO), the ranking member of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Protecting our Infrastructure of Pipelines and Enhancing Safety Act, the PIPES bill.

I thank the chairmen of the subcommittee, the full committee, and also the members of the Energy and Commerce Committee, Representative MIKE CAPUANO, and members of the Energy and Commerce Committee on our

side. This is a good bipartisan product, something that is pretty rare around here these days.

It reauthorizes the Department of Transportation's pipeline safety program for 4 years and includes a number of important measures that will better protect our communities, ensuring that pipelines are a safe means to transport natural gas, hazardous liquids, and crude oil.

Most importantly, this bill gives the Secretary of Transportation new emergency order authority to impose certain emergency restrictions and safety measures on pipeline operators to address an imminent hazard resulting from an incident or an unsafe practice, which is authority that doesn't currently exist.

Here is a good example. Fairly recently, we had a defective pipeline from China. We shouldn't be buying pipeline from China. But anyway, we had some defective, junky Chinese product pipeline, and there was an incident. But the administrator of the Pipeline and Hazardous Safety Materials Agency does not have the authority to order a nationwide inspection or removal of an imminent hazard, i.e., defective Chinese pipeline. All they could do was voluntary guidance.

Now, we will have emergency order authority. Some were concerned that they would use this as a way to end-run the regulatory process on other matters that are not an imminent hazard to health and safety, and there are provisions in the bill that would prevent that.

We are also pushing them to complete the mandates of the last bill, 2011, a bipartisan bill, where they have 16 mandates that Congress required that we felt were needed and prudent. And they are not through the regulatory process as yet. So we are moving them forward on that, and hopefully, the trolls down at the Office of Management and Budget who hold these things up—hello, do you live near a pipeline—that they will get the message and they will get these vital provisions that have been too long delayed.

It gives Federal, State, and emergency local responders MSDS sheets, safety sheets, so we know what the oil is. We have had past spills where we couldn't figure out what they were dealing with for days, and that is not acceptable.

It gives the agency the authority to have standards for underground natural gas storage facilities, but it allows States like Oregon, which has seven of these, to go above those standards so that the States can better protect their citizens.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Oregon an additional 1 minute.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, it would put a small fee on operators of underground storage tanks that would help to support the safety programs.

I would say with respect to funding, the bill is funded at current baseline levels. We should have provided them additional funds to carry out their numerous pipeline safety missions, but unfortunately, we couldn't reach bipartisan agreement on providing additional resources.

This bill does, however, increase grants to States to help them carry out their intrastate pipeline safety programs. It reauthorizes funding for pipeline safety information grants to communities, which are important to my constituents.

There are pipelines in places that no one is aware. There is one that runs down the middle of the Willamette Valley, all the way down, that supplies the Eugene Airport and a storage facility down in Eugene. A number of years ago, there was a news story, like: what pipeline? There are new developments going in. The signs are buried under blackberry bushes, and people aren't aware of these things. So we have to make certain those pipelines are safe.

The new provisions for coastal areas are absolutely critical to make sure those are maintained at the highest standard and built to the highest standard in other critical resource areas.

All in all, I congratulate my colleagues and recommend this bill.

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER), the chairman of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the PIPES Act. I want to commend Chairman DENHAM, Ranking Member CAPUANO, and Ranking Member DEFAZIO for all the work they have put into this bill. I also want to thank Chairman FRED UPTON from the Energy and Commerce Committee for the great relationship we have been able to develop. In these bills, we share jurisdiction, so we have been able to work and incorporate provisions from both the committees.

I also want to thank my colleagues on the Senate Commerce, Science, and Transportation Committee who have worked with us over the past month to produce the legislation we are considering today.

Pipelines are vital for getting energy products to markets and users. It is one of the safest modes of transportation, if not the safest. I believe this bill will build on the safety advances that we have been making.

Congress last authorized the pipeline safety bill in 2011, and that bipartisan act charged DOT with updating regulations and procedures across a host of issues. But DOT needs to finish out those provisions, and this bill includes strong transparency and reporting requirements to keep pressure to finish the 2011 work.

Another major provision in this act provides PHMSA with emergency order authority for pipelines. Most other Department of Transportation modal administrations have EO authority, which allows regulators to act quickly when they identify an industrywide safety issue that poses an imminent hazard to the public.

As we crafted this language, we took great care to balance a variety of concerns. This bill maintains the Transportation Committee language that requires PHMSA to consult with industry stakeholders and other regulators prior to issuing an EO so that PHMSA understands the potential impact on the economy, end users, and safety.

We also included extensive due process procedures on the back end so that if the agency makes a wrong call, affected parties will have redress, both administratively and judicially.

PHMSA is also required to issue regulations to carry out this authority, including requiring administrative law judge procedures that mirror similar requirements in the hazmat EO authority.

This is a good bill. It builds on the work that we did in 2011. It is developed in a bipartisan, bicameral manner.

Again, I thank Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. UPTON, Mr. PALLONE, and the Senate for their work and their leadership on this bill.

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Energy and Power—which, of course, I love that name—from the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to acknowledge some of my colleagues who worked together diligently with my office to draft this bipartisan PIPES Act that will help to modernize and secure our Nation's vast network of energy pipeline infrastructure.

Specifically, Mr. Speaker, I recognize my colleagues from the Energy and Commerce Committee, including Chairman UPTON and Ranking Member PALLONE, as well as Energy and Power Subcommittee Chairman ED WHITFIELD.

Additionally, Mr. Speaker, I would like to acknowledge my colleagues from the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, including Chairman SHUSTER and Ranking Member DEFAZIO, as well as Railroads, Pipelines, and Hazardous Materials Subcommittee Chairman DENHAM and Ranking Member CAPUANO, the fine gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. Speaker, this bipartisan piece of legislation improves safety by closing gaps in Federal standards and improving protection of coastal areas, including the Great Lakes.

Additionally, this bill will enhance the quality and timeliness of Pipeline and Hazardous Material Safety Administration rulemakings, promote better use of data and technology to improve pipeline safety, and leverage Federal and State pipeline safety resources to assist State and local communities.

Mr. Speaker, this is a fine piece of bipartisan legislation, and I am honored

and privileged to stand before the House and ask all of my colleagues to support this outstanding bipartisan piece of legislation.

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER).

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly rise in strong support of this legislation, which really includes some critical protections for one of our Nation's most precious assets. And that, of course, is the Great Lakes, which has 20 percent of our Nation's freshwater drinking supply, as well as it provides hundreds of jobs and billions of dollars of economic activity.

Today, there are millions of gallons per day of hazardous liquids which are transported through a number of lines in the Great Lakes. Mr. Speaker, we absolutely need energy in all transparency. We need the energy, but we need to make sure that we are transiting in a very safe and environmentally secure way because there is zero room for error in the Great Lakes.

There is a 62-year-old pipeline that is called line 5 that runs under the Straits of Mackinac, which is right in between Lake Huron and Lake Michigan. Any rupture there would be very, very difficult, if not impossible, to contain. This bill has a number of provisions in regards to line 5, for instance, that would conduct internal integrity assessments at least once a year.

This bill also designates the Great Lakes as a USA ecological resource, which is very important.

As well, it also makes sure that we have emergency spill response plans if, in the case of ice coverage, which really considers the unique environment of the Great Lakes.

In regards to Enbridge, there is also a line 6B which runs under the Saint Clair River, which is in my district. A number of years ago—and Chairman UPTON was talking about this particular line that had a spill just outside of his district—but this part of 6B runs under something called the Saint Clair River, again, a very environmentally sensitive artery for the Great Lakes.

We talked to Enbridge. And long story short, they came to the right conclusion there. They actually completely replaced almost 3,600 feet of this pipeline under the Saint Clair River. So they did the right thing there. They had been reluctant to address that.

Again, we need the energy, Mr. Speaker, but we need to make sure that we are transiting energy in a very safe way and in an environmentally sensitive way. I think this bill today goes a long way to address many of the concerns that we have had in the Great Lakes.

I thank Chairman DENHAM again for yielding the time and for taking these issues into consideration.

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN), my friend who serves on the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues from the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee for letting us Energy and Commerce folks have some time.

According to the Congressional Research Service, the United States has more than 2.9 million miles of pipelines in our vast network. According to the Texas Pipeline Association, Texas has more than 320,000 miles of intrastate pipelines.

□ 1745

As a lifelong Houstonian, there has never been a time in my life when I haven't lived along a pipeline easement. Needless to say, in Texas, we know pipelines, but we also know about the importance of safety.

Every day, industry moves millions of gallons or cubic feet of domestically produced and refined product without any problems. Since 2005, the United States has seen a general decline in the number of pipeline releases or accidents that result in environmental damage or personal injury.

We understand that the compounds moved via pipeline pose a risk, and we must effectively manage and mitigate that risk to protect our citizens and the environment. Today I think we are taking another step in the right direction.

The bill before the House today is a good bill that attempts to lay down concrete rules of the road for the next 5 years. For the sake of our constituencies, we need to pass this bipartisan bill in a bipartisan way. I would like to voice my support for this bill and ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to do the same.

Four years ago we gave PHMSA a job to do. While some of their work has been completed, there is still work to do. That is why this bill directs PHMSA to prioritize rulemaking and complete the work before them. We should not continue to add requirements on their plate. We should allow PHMSA the time and, most importantly, give them the resources required to finish this important job. I would like to express support for the PHMSA workforce management language.

We need inspectors in the field working closely with their industry partners to avoid another emergency situation. In my opinion, robust inspection is the best option available for everyone involved. If we reach the enforcement stage, that means something has gone wrong and we are too late. Industry, PHMSA, and the workers support this provision.

The second provision I would like to support is the emergency authority for PHMSA. While this provision may not be perfect, it represents a strong balance between enforcement and review. It is important to keep in mind that this is emergency authority. Unfortunately, when there is an incident involving a pipeline, we need to act with speed, efficiency, and resolve.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I want our executive agencies on the scene ensuring we are protecting the people and the environment. We must ensure that people have confidence in the pipeline system, and effective crisis management will help build that belief.

I appreciate the hard work that went into crafting this provision. Compromise is not easy, so I want to thank both sides for drafting these provisions. I know there is more work ahead, but I look forward to supporting the current bill.

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. KNIGHT).

Mr. KNIGHT. Mr. Speaker, on October 23, a gas leak was discovered at one of the 115 wells at the Aliso Canyon natural gas storage facility located in my district near Porter Ranch, California. I want to thank Congressman BRAD SHERMAN, who lives in Porter Ranch and was a great partner in this terrible tragedy, making sure that people were taken care of and we could move past this and move quickly to getting this taken care of.

This leak persisted for 118 days and was recognized as one of the largest disasters of 2015. During this time, residents of the surrounding neighborhoods suffered. Some temporarily relocated their families. Two schools were permanently relocated, at least for that semester, and many businesses were put on hold.

As the Representative for Porter Ranch, my immediate priority was to protect my constituents who live there and then ensure that this situation was resolved as quickly as possible. At the same time, I wanted to make sure that a crisis like this can never happen in our communities again. Today we take a giant step forward in doing just that.

In February, I introduced the Natural Gas Leak Prevention Act, which would require the Secretary of Transportation to issue adequate safety standards for natural gas storage facilities like Aliso Canyon in Porter Ranch and another very large facility, Honor Rancho in Valencia, which is also in my district.

The SAFE PIPES Act contains the language from the Natural Gas Leak Prevention Act as well as provisions to create an Aliso Canyon task force that would investigate the causes of the leak and recommend further actions to prevent such disasters in the future.

This is the type of swift and effective action that we need in order to prevent our communities and our families from tragedies like the Porter Ranch gas leak.

I want to thank many people who were involved in this situation. A special thanks to Paula Cracium and the

entire neighborhood council for providing support to the community in its time of need. I would also like to thank my colleague, Representative JEFF DENHAM, for his efforts to move this measure forward, including flying down to my district in March to tour the facility with the people involved.

I would like to thank, as well, Senator DEB FISCHER and Chairman BILL SHUSTER for their immense support and the many staff members who worked tirelessly on this legislation.

This terrible tragedy had real impacts on the lives of thousands of people I represent. We cannot undo the damage that was done in Porter Ranch, but we can and must make sure every effort to mitigate the impacts on their day-to-day lives and assist in the recovery process.

It is time to move forward on comprehensive legislation to prevent another incident from happening in our communities ever again. I would like to say that this would never, ever happen again; but without action, without us moving forward, without people working together and Congress working together, this can happen. So this type of legislation is needed, and the people who are affected appreciate this; and the people who have worked on this, I appreciate very much.

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN).

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, as my colleague from California pointed out, we in Porter Ranch experienced the largest natural gas leak in history. Seven thousand families were evacuated for months, and yet, as I speak, there are no Federal regulations for underground natural gas storage facilities, and the State regulations are surprisingly minimal, even in famously green California. Why? Because the natural gas industry and regulators believed that natural gas was only a problem if you were within a few hundred feet.

What we have experienced with this multibillion-cubic-foot leak is 7,000 families evacuated from an area in a 5-mile radius because the volatile organic compounds and the mercaptan in that natural gas caused enormous health problems. That is why I went to the President of the United States and the Vice President at the caucus that we attended and got a public commitment that we would get regulations probably this year.

This legislation is important because it makes it clear that, while PHMSA has the regulatory authority to act, if they don't act, they are required to act within 2 years under this legislation.

I am pleased to say that the legislation includes a provision that I think is very important and which I have championed from the beginning, and that is to clarify that a State can adopt tougher standards than whatever the Federal Government adopts.

The legislation also officially establishes the Department of Energy's Aliso Canyon natural gas task force. That task force is already up and running. We are working with it. It is the brainchild of Senators BOXER and FEINSTEIN, and I think formally establishing it in this regulation makes sense.

We need to adopt tough natural gas storage safety regulations for this entire country because Aliso Canyon, the storage facility next to Porter Ranch, was only the fifth largest natural gas storage field. There could be others. It could be in your district. That is why we need tough standards, and if we don't get them from PHMSA this year, we will have legislation requiring them within 2 years after the enactment of this legislation.

I urge a ''yes'' vote.

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I would just like to close out by simply repeating what I said earlier. I am very happy, very proud to have worked on this bill. I am very happy and very satisfied with the way we worked cooperatively. I want to thank the staff on our side who worked on it, Jennifer Esposito Homendy and Steve Carlson on my staff. I want to thank all the staff on the Republican side.

I know that America has this view that we hate each other and we never talk to each other and we do nothing but call each other names. I have done that in private, of course, but the truth is this is exactly the way it is supposed to work. Absent not getting a few things I wanted, this was actually a pleasure to work on. I am very proud of the work product. I am very proud of the work environment that we have. I think this is a bill that the American people can be proud of. I think it is a bill that the Congress can be proud of.

Again, I want to thank everyone who worked with us on this. I look forward to the President's signature.

Again, I want to thank the staff. Let's be honest, we take all the credit. We do the big speeches and all that kind of stuff, but without the staff, we couldn't get this done. I want to thank everybody involved with it for their professionalism, for their enthusiasm, for their long nights and difficult time. I look forward to doing this again in 4 years.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts. Mr. CAPUANO has been a great partner in this. This has been going on for many years now, many months of roundtables, many months of hearings, and it has been a true pleasure working together in a bipartisan way to address our differences, but most importantly, to actually address the safety of the American public.

This is a big bill: 2.6 million miles of pipeline, 64 percent of our Nation's energy. We didn't take it lightly. We wanted to hear from the public. We wanted to hear from stakeholders across the country, and we wanted to hear from Members across the country representing their districts. It was truly a bipartisan effort.

We appreciate the support and work of the ranking member and full committee chairman of the Committee on Energy and Commerce as well as the ranking member and the committee chairman of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

Specifically, I want to thank Mr. KNIGHT for his leadership on this issue. You never expect to have an emergency in the middle of deliberating on a bill. In this case, we did. He showed real leadership in coming to the table and inviting us out to his district to see it firsthand so that we could actually address safety concerns in this bill as well. It is a great bill to improve the safety of the country.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the final passage of this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the House Amendment to S. 2276.

Millions of miles of natural gas and hazardous liquid pipelines crisscross our country and touch countless communities. While these pipelines are an essential part of our nation's energy infrastructure, we all know—many from first-hand experience—that our reliance on these pipelines is inherently risky. Too often we hear of a pipeline failure, just like the Plains pipeline spill in my congressional district last year, which harms the health of local communities, the regional economy, and the environment. And we know that it really isn't a question of if there will be another spill in another community, but when.

With that is mind it is clear that we must do all we can to prevent the next spill from occurring and mitigate the damage when it does. We need to make the oil and gas industries that rely on these vulnerable methods of transportation more transparent and safer. We need to ensure that the federal regulator, the Pipeline and Hazardous Material Safety Administration (PHMSA), has the tools it needs to ensure the safe operation of natural gas and hazardous liquid pipelines under federal jurisdiction. And we owe it to the communities who are still picking up the pieces from these incidents to do all we can to learn from these tragedies to protect others in the future.

The bill before us today is an important step to do just that. This bill would provide PHMSA with the emergency order authority to appropriately respond to systemic pipeline issues. And it would ensure that important, long overdue rules are finalized and implemented, including the rules for automatic shutoff valves and leak detection. This technology is critical to minimizing the damage when a spill does occur.

This bill also includes specific provisions that apply the lessons learned from the Plains spill. Specifically, this legislation would mandate a study on the causes of corrosion including risks associated with insulated pipelines—the underlying cause of the Plains failure—and the best methods to prevent corrosion from occurring in this infrastructure. This legislation would also improve protection of

coastal areas, including coastal beaches, marine coastal waters, and the Great Lakes, by explicitly designating them as "unusually sensitive areas." This will bring more stringent safety requirements to these particularly vulnerable areas like my community. Finally, this legislation would require a report examining ways to improve hazardous liquid pipeline safety through integrity management actions, including an analysis of risk factors that may warrant more frequent inspections.

While nothing can take us back to prevent the Plains spill, this bill as a whole is an important, bipartisan effort to protect my and other communities going forward. And that is why I support it. We must embrace this opportunity for the sake of the health and safety of our constituents and the environment.

I would like to thank Energy and Commerce Committee Chairman UPTON and Ranking Member PALLONE as well as subcommittee Ranking Member RUSH for working with me to craft a bill that addresses the failures that led to the Plains spill. I would also like to commend staff from both the Energy and Commerce Committee and the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee for working in a bipartisan and bicameral way to get to this final product.

Our constituents are relying on us. I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation, and I hope we are able to send S. 2276 to the President for his signature in the very near future.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. DENHAM) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 2276, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONGRATULATIONS TO DUBOIS AREA MIDDLE SCHOOL ON BEING NAMED A ''SCHOOL TO WATCH''

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the students and staff at the DuBois Area Middle School on being named a Pennsylvania Don Eichhorn School to Watch. This is the 12th consecutive year that the middle school has earned this distinction, one of only two middle schools in the State to do so.

The Schools to Watch program was started in 1999 as a national program to identify exceptional middle schools across the country. As part of the program, State teams observe classrooms; interview administrators, teachers, parents, and students; and look at achievement data, suspension rates, quality of lessons, and student work.

DuBois Area Middle School will be formally recognized at an event coming up on June 25 in Arlington at the national Schools to Watch Conference.

Maintaining this level of excellence over more than a decade is hard work. I have the highest respect for the students, the staff, and the administration at the DuBois Area Middle School. I wish them the best of success in the future.

HONORING THE LIFE OF MUHAMMAD ALI

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. YARMUTH) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of my Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, one of the great joys of representing Louisville in the House of Representatives is that I get to constantly claim that I represent Muhammad Ali and the home of Muhammad Ali. It has always been a source of pride not just to me, but to all of my fellow Louisvillians that we could say that the Louisville Lip, the greatest of all time, called Louisville home.

Now one of the brightest lights in the world has extinguished. Muhammad Ali passed away last Friday after a long and courageous battle with Parkinson's disease, and the world has experienced a collective grief period. The joy of his accomplishments, the recognition of his commitment to peace, to tolerance, to respect, to love, all of those things, have come from all over the world.

□ 1800

So tonight, some of my colleagues and I have come to the floor to talk about Muhammad Ali, his life, his legacy, personal stories, the impact that he has had on our lives and on this country's life and on the world. He will be laid to rest this Friday in Louisville. Former President Clinton will eulogize him, and many leaders from around the world will be there to pay their respects.

But I go back many, many years. When I was 16 years old, living in Louisville, having watched him—then, Cassius Clay, an 8-to-1 underdog—upset the great, terrifying Sonny Liston in Miami, and then going to the airport the next day to welcome him home.

I stood outside the airport. There weren't a lot of people there that day. And as Cassius Clay emerged from that terminal and looked around and drew himself up, I said I had never seen a more beautiful human specimen in my life.

So when he called himself not just the greatest of all time, but the prettiest of all time, I was not going to argue with him. Of course, I wasn't going to argue with him about much.

That was my first personal exposure to Muhammad Ali. He was a man who gained fame in a violent game, but he earned his immortality as a kind, gentle, and caring soul. In the later years, when I got to know him better and spent more time around him, that is the one thing that always came through: his wonderful soul.

I don't know that I have ever known a person or seen a person who got more joy out of making a child smile as Muhammad Ali. And there was never a time when he was in the presence of children where he didn't make an effort to stop, joke with them, play with them. That was a source of incredible joy for him.

So, as we remember Muhammad Ali tonight, we remember not just his boxing prowess. We remember the courage he showed outside the ring.

He came to age in a very, very turbulent period in American history: during the civil rights demonstrations, when America was experiencing a convulsion over how to deal with the issue of race. And then the Vietnam war—a war whose opposition Ali paid a dear price for in 1967—refusing to be drafted into the armed services, knowing that it would cost him his boxing career, understanding that he might well go to jail and never fight again, but willing to stand for principles. And in doing that, I think he turned the country around and made them view the Vietnam war in a different light. It wouldn't have happened, but for Muhammad Ali. He was not the only one, of course, but he was the most prominent one.

Later, who can forget lighting that torch in the Atlanta Olympics in 1996, shaking from the Parkinson's disease that he had, but inspiring millions. And, again, making a statement about disabilities that meant so much to so many.

So tonight, as we hear from various Members about Muhammad Ali, I think what will come through is not just, again, his skills as an athlete, but his contributions as a citizen of the world and someone who has left a lasting legacy, not just on people's lives individually, but on the civilization as a whole.

I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN).

Mr. COHEN. I want to thank Mr. YARMUTH for putting together this hour. I think it is important that we recognize icons in our society and people who have contributed so much, as you well expressed, to American culture and to the thinking in our country about war, about race, and about people with disabilities. Those are three very, very major areas that Muhammad Ali had a great impact on.

You related back to when you were 16 years old. I was not quite 15 years old. At that time, my family had moved to Coral Gables, Florida. We lived there

from 1961 to 1964. During that period, Muhammad Ali's second home was Miami Beach and the 5th Street Gym.

During that period is when Ali, as Cassius Clay, had won the Olympic gold medal—and I remember him winning the Olympic gold medal in 1960, in Rome—and when his professional career started. He probably started in Louisville, but he was quickly in Miami Beach fighting.

So he was on the news all the time in Miami Beach and on the sports shows and whatever else, but always on TV and a personality in Miami Beach.

My granddad gave me $20, which was a lot of money, on February 25, 1964, if I remember—and I went to that fight. I was sitting probably in the highest seat in the Miami Beach Convention Center and watching that fighting by myself. My dad wasn't so much into it, but my grandfather gave me that $20 and I went to it.

I have got my docket. It's a great looking Clay-Liston ticket, in good shape, and a couple of programs from that event, which I am proud to have. I have been a fan of his, and I know how much of an impact he had on our world.

I was also a boxing fan of Floyd Patterson. Floyd Patterson was a previous champion. The first time that Floyd fought Muhammad Ali, I have to admit that I was cheering for Floyd. Floyd didn't do too well. He hurt his back and was taunted by Ali. He wanted him to say his name. And he punished him pretty good through 12 rounds.

But the second time they fought, which was in the early seventies, Patterson did a lot better. They stopped the fight at the end of the sixth or the beginning of the seventh. And it was closer to even. After the fight, as I understand it, Ali told the referee not to stop the fight because Patterson is fighting so well and he should be able to continue fighting and it wasn't fair to stop it.

I saw an interview with then-Cassius Clay with Steve Allen from 1963 that is on the Internet. In that interview, they said something about Floyd Patterson. First, Clay made a joke and he said that Liston knocked him out twice in one round. And Floyd's jaw was somewhat challenged. He said his leg should sue his body for lack of support. And then he kind of stopped and laughed and chuckled and said: I shouldn't say that; I like Floyd. Of course, that was before. Floyd didn't recognize his new name.

Louisville was the home of Cassius Clay/Muhammad Ali. One of the great attractions in Louisville is the Muhammad Ali Center, which I have had the opportunity to visit and go through. You can sit and watch all of Ali's fights, any one of them. Sit in a chair and push a button and there it is. And just watch any fight. I watched that second Patterson-Ali fight. Floyd was doing pretty good through those six rounds.

It is more than for boxing. It is a center. And it is about what he did for children and there are a lot of displays about what he did for children and what he did for peace and his efforts around the world. I think that is the great thing about Muhammad Ali. They didn't build a boxing museum. They built a center about all of his desires for freedom and for helping people around the globe and showing we are all one.

As he said back in I think January of this year, his religion of Islam was not about San Bernardino and Brussels or Paris or any other place there have been attacks. Islam was a religion of love, and it should be that way. And it was not the religion he knew. Anybody who thought it was that way and wanted to discriminate against people based on their religion were wrong, because it wasn't that type of religion.

So he was still, up until this year, taking positions of conscience to try to steer people in the right direction.

I keep under my glass on my office desk a quote from Muhammad Ali. It is on a postcard that I got at the Muhammad Ali Center. It shows Muhammad Ali in the ring kind of dancing around. And it says: ''The fight is won or lost away from witnesses—behind the lines, in the gym, and out there on the road, long before I dance under those lights.''

And it made me think about what we do in politics. Our elections are generally not won—if you are serious about your job and your constituents—right before elections. It is done during your term of office and what you do for your constituents and how you vote and what you do for folks, which is the same thing as a fighter being out there in the gym and on the road doing roadwork, hitting the bag, and training.

So Ali is what I look at when I sit down. It is right underneath my desk. And I see that and he kind of guides me—and he guides everybody—in that way, if you think about that. That is what life is about: preparation and having a plan and taking action to implement the plan.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON).

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. I thank the gentleman from Louisville for organizing this Special Order this evening.

I can't think of an athlete who more impacted my life and certainly the lives of people in our generation.

The gentleman from Louisville started in 1960—or maybe it started when you were 16—but watching then-Cassius Marcellus Clay in the 1960 Olympics in Rome—a legendary Olympics that produced so many highlights of American athleticism, from Bob Hayes to Rafer Johnson and, of course, this young, boyish-looking, but eloquent and masterful heavy-weight that moved like nothing else I had ever seen or would ever see since.

My father worked three jobs. About the only time he was home on a Friday night, we would watch the Gillette Sports Hour, which was the boxing matches that would occur.

My dad loved to follow boxing. He was a big Joe Louis and Rocky Marciano fan. Of course, my dad's generation, when Cassius Marcellus Clay came along, were not happy with his poetry and braggadocio manner. As a kid, we thought it was the coolest thing. And I would always remind my dad that he never made a boast that his fists couldn't back up.

And the poetry. He was ahead of his time in terms of rap, but he also was ahead of his time in terms of what he brought to the sport.

As the distinguished gentleman from Louisville pointed out, when he stepped into the ring with Sonny Liston, we all feared for his life. But as it turned out, he had that speed and that endurance and his incredible skills. He did everything that a boxer shouldn't do, but he was able to do it because of the exceptional ability.

How do I know this? We are fortunate to have in this Chamber somebody who was in the ring with Muhammad Ali. He was in the ring with him, Sonny Liston, and Joe Frazier. BOB BRADY of Philadelphia was a sparring partner and used in the ring.

As you all know, BOB BRADY is a pretty big guy. And he also can move. He maybe doesn't look so nowadays, but he still looks pretty fierce. I wouldn't want to get in the ring with BOB BRADY.

But I asked him once to explain what that might have been like. And he was dear friends with Joe Frazier. He said: But you wouldn't get in a ring with Sonny Liston unless you had a lot of people around you. He said he was the meanest person he ever met or got in the ring with in his life.

And I said: What about Muhammad Ali? He said: There is nothing like him. He said he was a freak. I said: What do you mean, a freak? He said: A freak of nature, because of what he was able to do with his speed, with his grace, and the simplistic thing of just being able to move away, from skills that, when you watch these films today, you are in awe of them.

I can remember coming in and talking about the Ali shuffle when we saw him do that against Cooper in England. No one had ever seen anything like that. And when he came back and he got in the ring and he would dance, you just knew that he was going to win—the confidence that he always exuded.

□ 1815

Then, as JOHN YARMUTH pointed out, he became so much bigger than the sport itself because of his conviction, and he did it during a tumultuous time.

The sixties will probably go down and forever be remembered as a great crucible for the history of this country when, converging at the same time were the civil rights movement, an education movement that was spawned by the launching of Sputnik, the civil rights movement that also spawned the antiwar movement, that spawned the

woman's movement, that spawned the ecological movement—all came about during this tumultuous time.

And who was one of the leaders? One of the most recognized faces in America, beyond perhaps John F. Kennedy and Martin Luther King, was Muhammad Ali, and he brought so much more because of his conviction.

I remember my experience of meeting him for the first time in East Hartford, Connecticut, working at Woodland Auto Body, putting tire black on cars. If you ever had this luxurious duty, you would not appreciate it.

All of a sudden, this gold Toronado pulled into Woodland Auto Body. Now, most of the people who worked at Woodland Auto Body were of African American lineage. I saw this Toronado pull in—and if you know anything about a Toronado, it has one long window—and when they rolled down the window, there was Bundini Brown. He said: Do you know how to get to WINF radio station?

I said: Well, yes, sir. It's just up the street here.

I looked in the back, and there was Muhammad Ali, and I said: The champ.

I said: Wait right here. And I went inside because I knew my coworkers, who certainly enjoyed seeing me have to put tire black on cars—I came running in and I said: Muhammad Ali is out here. The champ is here.

And they looked at me and said: Yeah, right, and Santa Claus is coming also.

But they came out. And emerging from this gold Toronado was this unbelievably gracious human being, of course, at 6 foot 3, certainly towering above me, and even among some of the brothers who were out there talking. But we couldn't believe that he was actually there in our midst.

If you believe there is a certain aura that people have around them, he had it. He was given a gift, and he used it.

That picture that appeared in The New York Times, with so many athletes of the period, the legendary Jim Brown and Bill Russell all sitting at that table, understanding what this youthful but spiritual individual had done not just for Black America, but what he did for the world in terms of speaking truth to power.

I will always remember that grace and elegance and rooting for him, and even being scared to death, in the Rumble in the Jungle, that George Foreman might do him harm, and said, ''Oh, my God. What is he doing, hanging on the ropes?'' which later became famous for rope-a-dope.

But he was the most unique athlete that I have ever observed in my life. And beyond that unique talent that he brought to the ring, and those skills that he brought to bear with unprecedented grace and ability, he also made the world a better place, as the gentleman from Louisville pointed out, and distinguished himself far beyond what he accomplished in the ring by his simple pleas to America.

I was so happy to see him, in his later years, atone for some of the cruel things he had said during his life to Joe Frazier and to other people and some of the taunts that he did. It just showed the depth and the character of someone we so admired.

I thank the gentleman so much for allowing me the opportunity to share that reminiscence about The Greatest.

Mr. YARMUTH. I thank the gentleman, and since he referenced the poetry and the facts that Muhammad Ali is sometimes actually considered the godfather of rap, I would like to read one thing that he wrote. This is right after the Olympics in 1960:

To make America the greatest is my goal,
So I beat the Russian and I beat the Pole,
And for the USA won the medal of gold,
Italians said, you're greater than the Cassius of old.
We like your name, we like your game,
So make Rome your home if you will.
I said, I appreciate the hospitality,
But the USA is my country still,
Because they're waiting to welcome me in Louisville.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. BEATTY).

Mrs. BEATTY. I thank my colleague, Congressman YARMUTH.

Mr. Speaker, to the rest of my colleagues, it is indeed an honor for me to come tonight to share in the life and the legacy of The Greatest, of the champ, of Muhammad Ali.

Like my colleagues, I followed his career and was mesmerized by his wit, his poetry, and, more specifically, his boxing skill.

But for me tonight, it was a special honor when I became a Member of this United States Congress. It was during the 113th Congress and the 44th Congressional Black Caucus Foundation's Annual Legislative Conference. During that conference, each member of the Congressional Black Caucus can submit the name of someone they think has made a difference in the lives of others, whether it was for health care, whether it was for civil rights, or making a difference through philanthropy.

As I thought about all of the individuals that I could submit, I was very proud that I submitted the name Muhammad Ali. It was even a greater honor when he received the most votes from my colleagues, and he received one of our Phoenix Awards, named after Ralph Metcalfe.

So when I stood on that stage before thousands and thousands of individuals, including the President of these United States, President Barack Obama, and watched the video that his family sent because he wasn't able to attend that dinner, I sat there, honored and proud because this Black man made a difference in the lives of so many young children, so many adults. And today, we come here and we salute and we honor a great legacy.

So I want to thank you, Congressman YARMUTH, for letting me make this small contribution.

Mr. YARMUTH. I thank the gentlewoman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS).

Mr. MEEKS. I thank the gentleman from Louisville.

Mr. Speaker, when I heard of the greatest of all time's passing, my heart was filled and heavy because he was very significant in my life. When you just think of him—and I got to meet him first as a young boy. I was about 10 years old.

My dad was a professional boxer. He is one of 49, one of 49 individuals to get knocked out by Rocky Marciano. But that also brought him into the area where he got to know many of the boxers in training, et cetera. He would train in the same gym in New York where Sugar Ray Robinson was, and where Bundini and Youngblood were, who were always in Ali's corner. So I got to see Ali, this Cassius Clay train at an early age, and fell in love with him immediately.

Number one what you could do when you saw Muhammad Ali, at that time you saw a young man who was confident. And yes, as I hear my colleagues talking about his athletic ability and skills, he had all of that.

But what I would like to talk about briefly tonight, what was the highest of esteem for Muhammad Ali was his brain. There is nothing that Ali did that he didn't think about. Everything that he did, there was a reason for it.

When he first saw this wrestler and how people hated him, this George guy, but he saw how all the people were coming to watch and paying all of their money because they were talking, he was talking. He said here's a good way to promote myself and to make sure that he could make some money, and so he did that.

Then he thought about calling and naming the round that he was calling people in and all of that. And so he did all of those things, but there was a reason for it. He was a promoter. He knew what it took. People at that time, many of them wanted to go see the Louisville Lip shut up, but each time he would win.

What I just want to say about Ali, though, his brain and his heart, his brain and his heart. Because throughout my lifetime, I had several times to be with him and to get to know him a little bit. I will just, for brevity of time, talk about one real quick.

I can recall I used to drive him at times when he was in New York. So I would get in the car, and he would get in the car. Of course, he is the funniest guy in the world. He would be telling jokes and doing everything else. So we were driving down the street in Brooklyn, New York. I remember it like it was yesterday. I stopped at a light. All of a sudden, Muhammad is looking around, and he jumps out of the car. He jumps. There were some kids on the corner. He jumps out, and he goes and starts shadowboxing with them. The kids are saying: Oh, the champ, the champ is here, the champ is here.

He would just talk to them. He was encouraging them to go to school and

encouraging them to do good things. I know because when you listened to all of the stories afterwards, individuals were giving personal stories. Never would you see an individual as popular and well known as Ali where an individual could actually talk about a personal story, because Ali wasn't one that was hidden behind bodyguards or this one or that one. He was one that always wanted to be the man on the street involved with people to make a difference in their life. He set an example for individuals.

So I think of the example, too, because of the size of Ali, I heard somebody talking about the rumble in the jungle. I used to go up to the camp and watch them train in Deer Lake. I was there when he was training for George Foreman. I was there, stayed up there for about a week. There, again, talk about consciousness, he had these huge rocks, talking about all of the great African American fighters before him because he never forgot who he was or where he came from, but he had these rocks there, and he was in the gym training.

I can remember he would get up on the ropes. He put his hands up, and Angelo Dundee would say: Get off the ropes, champ. Get off the ropes. Get off the ropes, champ. You are going to get killed on those ropes.

About the second round of training, he went over, and he said to Angelo: Shut up. I know what I am doing.

Nobody knew what he was doing, but he knew what he was doing. He always outthought everyone. He outthought them. That was the key to this thing, the greatest of all time.

So, Ali, I say this—I say this because I remember you saying this one time to someone:

If you want some gin, I'll get you in 10.
If you like wine, it will be round number nine.
If you think you're great, you'll fall in eight.
If you want to go to heaven, it will be round number seven.
But if you want to mix, I'll get you in six.
Talk that jive, you'll fall in five.
If you want to go like old Moore, I'll get you in four.
Mess with me, I'll reduce you to three.
If that won't do, you'll fall in two.
If the crowd wants some fun, you'll fall in one.
Why?
Because I float like a butterfly, and I sting like a bee. That's why nobody mess with Muhammad Ali.

Ali, we love you. We thank you for your contribution not only to Louisville, not only to the United States of America, not only to African Americans and to Africa, but to everyplace on this planet. You are, indeed, God's gift to this great planet. We thank God for your life and times. You will live on forever as the greatest of all time—and the prettiest.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD).

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. YARMUTH) for yielding this evening.

I am absolutely embarrassed to come after my friend, Congressman GREG MEEKS.

Why in the world would the gentleman put me on the schedule to come to the podium at this very moment?

But I thank the gentleman, in any event, for his friendship, and I thank the gentleman for his extraordinary leadership. I was in the gentleman's hometown of Louisville, Kentucky, a few weeks ago and absolutely enjoyed going to church with him and meeting many of his friends there in Louisville. The gentleman is a great Member of this body, and I thank the gentleman so very much.

But, Mr. Speaker, I stand with Congressman MEEKS and Congressman COHEN and all of my colleagues today to recognize and to remember a great American, a true American hero. We honor and we remember this extraordinary life and the accomplishments and the countless contributions of Muhammad Ali.

Born just 5 years before me in 1942 in Louisville, Kentucky, Cassius Marcellus Clay, Jr., was born to Cassius Marcellus Clay and Mrs. Odessa Lee Grady Clay. Those were his parents. On March 6, 1964, when I was a junior in high school, after joining the Nation of Islam, Cassius Clay became known as Muhammad Ali.

□ 1830

Mr. COHEN, I remember it like it was yesterday.

His interest in boxing began at the age of 12 after he reported a stolen bicycle to a local police officer named Joe Martin, who was also a boxing trainer. In 1959, Muhammad Ali was the National Golden Gloves Light Heavyweight Champion and National Amateur Athletic Union champion. After winning his first 19 fights—and that was absolutely incredible, winning his first 19 fights—including 15 knockouts, Muhammad Ali defeated Sonny Liston on February 25, 1964, to become the World Heavyweight Champion.

Muhammad Ali would then become the World Heavyweight Champion in 1964, 1974, and 1978, making him the first fighter to capture the heavyweight title on three separate occasions. In 1981, Muhammad Ali retired from professional boxing and dedicated his life to promoting world peace, fighting for civil rights, hunger relief, and just basic human values.

His humanitarian work included helping secure the release of 15 U.S. hostages. Many of my colleagues may have forgotten about that, but Muhammad Ali helped to release 15 U.S. hostages held in Iraq during the first Gulf War, four hostages held in Lebanon, and conducted goodwill missions to Afghanistan and to Cuba. Muhammad Ali even had the distinct honor of traveling to South Africa to meet Nelson Mandela following President Mandela's release from prison.

Ali received numerous awards in his life following his boxing career, including being inducted into the International Boxing Hall of Fame, receiving the Arthur Ashe Courage Award by ESPN, the Essence Living Legend Award, the Presidential Medal of Freedom in 2005 by then-President George W. Bush. The footage of that ceremony has been all over the news for the last few days, and I would encourage all of my colleagues to look at it if you haven't. He was given the Presidential Medal of Freedom in 2005 by President George W. Bush and the Otto Hahn Peace Medal for his work with the U.S. civil rights movement and the United Nations.

Mr. Speaker, I have used enough time this evening. I will simply close. I cannot close like my friend, Congressman GREG MEEKS, did a moment ago. That was a masterpiece, and I cannot wait to see the video of his closing on another day. It was extraordinary.

But I will conclude by saying that Muhammad Ali, the greatest of all time, was not only a champion in the boxing ring, but a champion of human rights and civil rights, who, during a difficult time in our Nation's history, stood on principle to end racism and bigotry in this country.

Muhammad Ali, we love you. May God bless you, and may God bless your family.

To the fans of Muhammad Ali all across the world, I thank you for supporting this great American, and I thank you for allowing us to come into your homes and be a part of this tribute this evening.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD).

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH).

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank both of my colleagues for allowing me to come before this body to speak on behalf of the people of the city of Chicago, the people of the First Congressional District.

Mr. Speaker, I must say that although Muhammad Ali was and is a native of Louisville—that is his birthplace—I must also claim that Chicago is his adoptive city. He spent many, many years in Chicago. He bought a home on South Kenwood Avenue in my district.

Mr. Speaker, as a young man, a young civil rights activist myself, I can't even express the pride that I had when I would travel down the street and point out to my young sons and anybody else who was with me that that is where Muhammad Ali lives. He was a man of the neighborhoods in Chicago. He touched many people—young people, old people, and people who didn't necessarily share his same political or religious ideas, but he touched them anyhow.

Mr. Speaker, Muhammad Ali was a man for all seasons. Yes, he achieved prominence in the boxing arena, in the sweet science of boxing, but he

achieved greatness because of the life that he led both inside of boxing and outside of boxing.

Mr. Speaker, on Saturday afternoons, many of us who had few heroes would gather around television sets and watch Muhammad Ali fight in the heavyweight division against other fighters and other boxers. One of his predictions came true when he defeated and knocked out his opposition in the time that he said he would, and there was a collective cheer that you could hear throughout the neighborhoods of Chicago.

He meant something to me. He meant something to others. Muhammad Ali not only achieved, worked hard, and sacrificed for excellence, but he also inspired excellence in others.

Muhammad Ali would walk down some of the main thoroughfares in Chicago: 47th Street, 79th Street, and Madison Avenue. He would walk down those streets, and the crowds would just gather around him and follow him. His beam in his eyes, the halo and the charisma that he had just made for an exciting time, a grand time for all of us.

Mr. Speaker, Muhammad Ali not only was a great boxer, but he was indeed a man for all times. Look at his following not just in Louisville, not just on the south and west sides of Chicago, but all across the Nation, all across the world, foreign countries, African countries specifically. The same kind of enthusiasm that he inspired, the same kind of reverence that he inspired to the young men and young women in Chicago, you could see the same kind of inspiration ran up in the Congo, in Nigeria, in Zaire, and in other places all across the world.

Mr. Speaker, when he retired, I remember as a freshman here in Congress when we had a session and we honored the 50 greatest athletes of the century. Here were some great athletes, but the one who I wanted to be with, the one who I was most excited about, the one who I wanted to be photographed with was only Muhammad Ali. Bart Starr, Kareem Abdul-Jabbar, and many, many others were here; but Muhammad Ali was here, and he kind of sucked the air out of the room.

Later, Mr. Speaker, when I chaired the Annual Legislative Conference, for the dinner, the gala—I chaired the gala—I was so honored that he came to me to accept an award from the Congressional Black Caucus with his lovely wife, Lonnie; another great time, another great memory.

But, Mr. Speaker, the greatest honor, the greatest moment of inspiration, my most profound memory of Muhammad Ali was when he refused to go to fight in the Vietnam war. I think, in my humble opinion, had he just been a great champion—we have had other great champions who are African American: Jack Johnson, Sugar Ray Robinson, and many others, many, many others who are great champions. But Muhammad Ali wasn't just a boxer. He didn't just inspire others to take up boxing.

I was a political activist in the sixties, and Muhammad Ali spoke to the quintessential aspect of all my activism when he said: Hell no, I won't go. Hell no, I won't go. No Vietnamese have ever called me the N word.

And he said it. I don't want to say it on the floor, but he said it.

□ 1845

Mr. Speaker, from that moment on, he solidified his appeal, his essence, his relationships; he solidified himself with all of the struggling people of the Nation, of the world.

Let me just say this: I thought about Muhammad Ali when I heard of his death, and I thought of trying to recapture some of my memories of him—how he walked, his gait, how he talked. I remember his size. I remember the face that was also a beautiful face. He was proud of how he looked.

But, Mr. Speaker, I guess what inspired me most about Muhammad Ali was how he did not surrender his faith, surrender his belief, surrender his core values to the U.S. Selective Service which drafted him.

Mr. Speaker, I don't remember the names of the men who were on that Selective Service committee. I don't remember anything about them. They thought that they were destroying The People's Champion, but they could not destroy The People's Champion. He rose even above all of those people who were officially appointed to bring him down. Nobody could knock out Muhammad Ali, in a real sense.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Kentucky for yielding, and I thank all of my friends.

We are friends when we come to celebrate someone as potent and powerful and, certainly, symbolic. But we should really recognize that The Greatest, Muhammad Ali, who had many homes—many of us can claim having had the privilege of him walking through many of our streets—was a husband, father, grandfather, and son to all of his family members that loved him.

Today I offer my deepest sympathy to his beautiful wife who worked so hard to create the Muhammad Ali Center, all of his children who gained his magnificent talents in many different forms and capacities, to be able to now not only suffer this loss, but mourn someone who probably in their life created such a space for so many years.

I rise today to join in celebrating—for that is what I would like to do—The People's Champion. He was truly the voice of a generation, advocating for the ending of inequality regarding African Americans, but as well, I believe he stood for opposing injustices all around the world.

The three-time world heavyweight boxing champion helped define the turbulent times in which he reigned as the most charismatic and controversial sports figure of the 20th century. We all know that he was born Cassius Marcellus Clay, Jr.

Over the past 30 years, he had his own boxing battle. I believe that time after time he knocked out Parkinson's disease because he lived with it, he let others know that they could live with it, and he worked every day to support the advocacy groups who were trying to battle Parkinson's.

I am reminded of a gold medal at the 1960 Olympic Games in Rome and being crowned the World Heavyweight Champion so many times. As I had watched him over these past years, the admiration and affection and respect grew much more looking at him as the iconic figure, the real spirit of can-do, the best of America, a man whose faith was very special to him, so much so that he was a conscience objective which was not understood. That Selective Service committee was right in Houston, Texas. He walked those streets, his case was tried there, and victory came because he refused to yield on his principles.

As one of his noteworthy opponents, Floyd Patterson, told author David Remnick some years ago: ''I came to see that I was a fighter and he was history.''

Ali traded banter with United States presidents and world leaders alike, verbally sparring with musical greats—The Beatles—and shaking hands with Mother Teresa.

His greatest triumph lies in his legacy as a champion, leader, social activist, and humanitarian, but also a mentor by distance of so many boys and girls, particularly our young men.

In my own hometown, a young boxer by the name of Eric Carr, first met him with one of our great sports figures, Lloyd Wells, down at the Hyatt Regency. He said that when the champ met him, the champ treated him like a longtime friend. He played around with him, maybe boxed with him. I may be adding something to it. But Eric Carr, as the day went on—it was in the boxing beginnings of his life—told him he wanted to be a champ just like him. Eric Carr went on to win boxing championships, but he will always remember how real Muhammad Ali was.

Let me say that as he fought for the future, he envisioned that we all would enjoy. I love to hear the bantering because it was wisdom of a philosopher.

His greatest triumph, as I indicated, was a humanitarian. At the apex of his career, lauded for his unparalleled physique and mesmerizing moves—I wish I could do a few of those right now—but he is more than a sum total of his athletic gifts.

His agile mind, buoyant personality, brash self-confidence, wouldn't you love him?

I often remember some of those words that he said:

> Float like a butterfly, sting like a bee. His hands can't hit what his eyes can't see.

Now you see, now you don't. George thinks he will, but I know he won't.

Don't count the days; make the days count. I'm young; I'm handsome; I'm fast. I can't possibly be beat.

But then he said:

Service to others is the rent you pay for your room here on Earth.

And so his inspiration continues.

I would often say that as he lived his life, we took joy.

As I close, Mr. Speaker, let me offer you these words, and let me thank him for the life that he has lived. Let me borrow from Shakespeare and say of Muhammad Ali:

He was a man. Take him for all in all. We shall not look upon his like again.

May The Greatest rest in peace.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding to me. I still see that ''float like a butterfly, sting like a bee.''

Muhammad Ali, again, rest in peace.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the life of boxing legend and social activist Mr. Muhammad Ali, whose words floated like a butterfly and punches stung like a bee, who died Friday at the age of 74.

The people's champion, was truly the voice of a generation, advocating for the African Americans battling racial inequality.

The three-time world heavyweight boxing champion helped define the turbulent times in which he reigned as the most charismatic and controversial sports figure of the 20th century.

The man who would come to be known as the ''Greatest of All Time,'' was born Cassius Marcellus Clay Jr. on Jan. 17, 1942 in Louisville, Kentucky.

Despite baffling Parkinson's disease for 30 years Muhammad Ali would live a full and consequential life, winning the Gold Medal at the 1960 Olympic Games in Rome and being crowned the world Heavyweight champion an unsurpassed three times.

As one of his noteworthy opponents, Floyd Patterson, told author David Remnick some years ago, ''I came to see that I was a fighter, while he was history.''

Ali traded banter with United States presidents and world leaders alike, verbally sparring with musical greats the Beatles, shaking hands with Mother Teresa.

His greatest triumph lies in his legacy as a champion, leader, social activist and humanitarian.

At the apex of his career, lauded for his unparalleled physique and mesmerizing moves.

He carried into the ring a physically lyrical, unorthodox boxing style fusing speed, agility and power more seamlessly than any boxer before him or since.

But, he was more than the sum total of his athletic gifts; he was a man of uncompromising principles.

His agile mind, buoyant personality, brash self-confidence and evolving set of personal convictions fostered a magnetism that the ring alone could not contain.

A masterful entertainer, Ali captivated audiences as much with his mouth as with his fists, narrating his life with a patter of inventive doggerel.

He was targeted by his country when, in 1966, he exercised his First Amendment right voicing political dissension and concern for humanitarian observation.

Ali was a purposeful fighter, and even more so, a principled human being, once reminding us all that he would, ''Fight for the prestige, not for [himself], but to uplift [his] little brothers who are sleeping on concrete floors today in America . . . living on welfare, . . . who can't eat, . . . who don't [have] knowledge of themselves, . . . [and cannot see a] future.''

Ali fought for the future he envisioned and that we all enjoy today.

As a conscientious objector to the Vietnam War, he refused to be inducted into drafting leading him to be banned from the sport he loved at the height of his career.

His inspiring courage and anti-war stance helped spearhead the growing anti-war movement of the 1960s.

The press called him the Louisville Lip. He called himself the Greatest.

Ali was the most important political-cultural figure to survive the deadly tumult of the 1960s and flourish during the 1970s.

Ali reawakened the American consciousness stating, ''Champions are made from something they have deep inside them—a desire, a dream, a vision.''

He eventually retired for good in 1981 and after being diagnosed with Parkinson's disease in 1984 as the only fighter to be heavyweight champion three times.

In 2005 Muhammad Ali was presented with the Presidential Medal of Freedom by President George W. Bush.

Ali received the President's Award from the NAACP soon after Obama's inauguration in 2009.

In 1996, he was trembling and nearly mute as he lit the Olympic caldron in Atlanta, but his smile induced a thunderous roar in what was one of the most celebrated Olympics moments ever.

His post-boxing humanitarian endeavors include putting his name to many initiatives for peace and humanitarian aid as well as anonymous donations of millions of dollars to a variety of individuals and organizations surpassing race and class barriers.

Despite battling with Parkinson's disease for three decades, he has inspired millions of people.

His work as a humanitarian has been immortalized in the Muhammad Ali Centre.

Explaining his resolve later in life, Ali said that, ''All my life, growing up as a little boy, I always said that if I got famous I'd do things for my people that other people wouldn't do.''

''I am an ordinary man who worked hard to develop the talent I was given,'' he said.

He was truly a legend—a statesman of the people.

Muhammad Ali was a product of America but a citizen of the world, at first hated and misunderstood but eventually beloved for the way he carried himself in dignified decline.

He will remain one of the most well-known and respected sports figures of all time—may his legacy be revered.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, let me borrow from Shakespeare and say of the Muhammad Ali:

''He was a man.

Take him for all in all.

We shall not look upon his like again.''

May the ''The Greatest'' rest in peace.

THE SAYINGS OF MUHAMMAD ALI—THE GREATEST OF ALL TIME

Muhammad Ali, considered to be the greatest heavyweight boxer, died June 3, 2016 in a Phoenix-area hospital.

He was 74 years old.

Here is a list of some of his best quotes (in no particular order):

1. ''Float like a butterfly, sting like a bee. His hands can't hit what his eyes can't see. Now you see me, now you don't. George thinks he will, but I know he won't.''

2. ''Service to others is the rent you pay for your room here on earth.''

3. ''I'm young; I'm handsome; I'm fast. I can't possibly be beat.''

4. ''Don't count the days; make the days count.''

5. ''If my mind can conceive it, and my heart can believe it—then I can achieve it.'' Jesse Jackson said this as early as 1983, according to the Associated Press, and Ali used it in his 2004 book.

6. ''It's hard to be humble when you're as great as I am.''

7. ''It isn't the mountains ahead to climb that wear you out; it's the pebble in your shoe.''

8. ''If you even dream of beating me you'd better wake up and apologize.''

9. ''Braggin' is when a person says something and can't do it. I do what I say.''

10. ''I am the greatest, I said that even before I knew I was.''

11. ''Only a man who knows what it is like to be defeated can reach down to the bottom of his soul and come up with the extra ounce of power it takes to win when the match is even.''

12. ''I'm so mean, I make medicine sick.''

13. ''I should be a postage stamp. That's the only way I'll ever get licked.''

14.''Impossible is just a big word thrown around by small men who find it easier to live in the world they've been given than to explore the power they have to change it. Impossible is not a fact. It's an opinion. Impossible is not a declaration. It's a dare. Impossible is potential. Impossible is temporary. Impossible is nothing.''

15. ''He who is not courageous enough to take risks will accomplish nothing in life.''

16. ''A man who views the world the same at 50 as he did at 20 has wasted 30 years of his life.''

17. ''If they can make penicillin out of moldy bread, they can sure make something out of you.''

18. ''I shook up the world. Me! Whee!''

19. ''I hated every minute of training, but I said, 'Don't quit. Suffer now and live the rest of your life as a champion.'''

20. ''At home I am a nice guy: but I don't want the world to know. Humble people, I've found, don't get very far.''

21. ''A man who has no imagination has no wings.''

22. ''He's (Sonny Liston) too ugly to be the world champ. The world champ should be pretty like me!''

23. ''I am the astronaut of boxing. Joe Louis and Dempsey were just jet pilots. I'm in a world of my own.''

24. ''I've wrestled with alligators. I've tussled with a whale. I done handcuffed lightning. And throw thunder in jail.''

25. ''Hating people because of their color is wrong. And it doesn't matter which color does the hating. It's just plain wrong.''

26. ''It's not bragging if you can back it up.''

27. ''I'm the most recognized and loved man that ever lived cuz there weren't no satellites when Jesus and Moses were around, so people far away in the villages didn't know about them.''

28. ''It's just a job. Grass grows, birds fly, waves pound the sand. I beat people up.''

29. ''I'm not the greatest, I'm the double greatest.''

30. ''Live everyday as if it were your last because someday you're going to be right.''

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman.

I yield once again to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN).

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, there is so much that has been said appropriately about Muhammad Ali that people in this era might not realize that when he was fighting, all of America really looked forward to his fights and watched them. The eyes of the Nation were glued to the television to see him fight and to see afterwards Howard Cosell speaking the sports talk to him and reviewing those fights.

He was a lot about Louisville. There is a street in Louisville named after him, Muhammad Ali Boulevard, and the Muhammad Ali Center.

Nobody carries on and will carry on Muhammad Ali's love of Louisville more than you, Mr. YARMUTH. I appreciate you having this hour. He was to Louisville in such a great way, and he was a great man to America. I thank you for putting this hour together.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS).

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. YARMUTH for hosting this hour.

Muhammad Ali was a good friend. He was someone that I had known that I had worked on some projects with. But more than that, my husband was one of those athletes. My husband was then the linebacker for the Cleveland Browns when Bill Russell and my husband, Sidney Williams, and Jim Brown all got together to support Muhammad Ali when, of course, he was not allowed to be a conscientious objector and was threatened with prison.

I got to know him sometime after that. We used his home for a very special event. I got to know his former wife, Veronica, and his children. One of his children worked in one of my programs.

This comes at a very difficult time for all of us. I loved him because he had courage. He had the courage to give up his career, had the courage to threaten to be imprisoned, and had the courage to fight. The Nation of Islam stood with him, and these athletes all stood with him. He was a great man. When he said he was The Greatest, he really was, because he was an unusual extraordinaire.

I will be at the funeral on Friday. I will be there with the family and the rest of the athletes that are still living that are going to be there to honor him.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman.

I yield again to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) for a quick comment.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, let me thank Mr. YARMUTH and say that I couldn't leave the mic without acknowledging that George Foreman is in Houston, and Evander Holyfield, only to say that the people that he fought became his dear friends. I know they would want me to say that.

Thank you so very much for allowing us to pay tribute to The Greatest.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, as we wrap up this tribute to the life of Muhammad Ali, I just want to express what I know all of my colleagues would feel, and that is our outpouring of love and support for Lonnie, his wife of 25 years, his many children, and his extended family. Lonnie's love and dedication inspired and energized Ali, even when his body was failing him. I know that the hearts of this body as well as the world go out to her and the rest of Muhammad Ali's family.

May he rest in peace. I thank him on behalf of everyone for his great contributions to humanity.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of a man who was a three-time heavyweight champion of the world, a victor at the Supreme Court of the United States, and one of the most remarkable men of the 20th Century—a man who truly earned his title: The Greatest.

Muhammad Ali was born Cassius Marcellus Clay Jr. in Louisville, Kentucky on January, 17, 1942. By age 18, he was the Light Heavyweight Gold Medalist at the 1960 Olympics. In 1964, he won the heavyweight world title. He would go on to hold that title—off-and-on—for another 15 years.

But Muhammad Ali was not merely one of the greatest fighters in history—he was also a champion of justice in a country struggling to find its way. Like Detroit's own great champion, Joe Louis, he was a lightning rod for controversy. His success angered those who disagreed with the simple principle that a person's worth was never lessened by the color of their skin. He showed courage when he stood up for civil rights at a time when it was dangerous to do so. He never backed down, never allowed his voice to be silenced because of his faith or his race. He was an example for countless men, women, and children who needed one.

Beyond his work in the ring and as part of the civil rights movement, Muhammad Ali was also an advocate for peace. He grew into his faith in a way that shows that Islam is a religion of peace and America is a place of tolerance when—at great personal cost—he spoke out against the Vietnam War. As a conscientious objector, he was stripped of his title and unable to fight for three years during his prime.

Convicted of refusing to report for military service, he appealed to the United States Supreme Court, where he won a unanimous (8–0) opinion reversing his conviction.

A champion boxer, a champion for civil rights, and a champion of peace—it is not possible to overstate Muhammad Ali's achievements. He was quite simply, The Greatest.

We will mourn his memory going forward, and we will remember him for his work. Most of all, we will continue to draw strength and inspiration from a man who knew the true meaning of being a Champion.

STOP THE FRANK

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I am slow to come to the floor because you can't compete with a Muhammad Ali commemorative Special Order. That is too much passion to follow. I just have little old legislative business on my mind. I am not talking about changing the world. I am just talking about changing our little part of the world.

I don't know if you remember, Mr. Speaker, when you first got here, you had to go downstairs and sign your name so that we could use that instead of a postage stamp on every piece of mail that you sent out the door. It is called the franking privilege.

I have a bill—it is H.R. 1873—that TAMMY DUCKWORTH and I introduced together to abolish that franking privilege. It is not going to take a lot to get that done. It is something that is within the complete control of us here in this institution, but it has been a challenge that is hundreds of years in the making.

I put mine on here, Mr. Speaker. This is my signature there on the front of every envelope I send out. If you want to know how to forge a check in my name, all you need to do is look at any envelope I send out the door.

Back in the day, had we been here in 1817, it might have been hard to find a postage stamp. In the name of getting congressional business done, the law of the land, carried over from England, was that you could sign your name on all of your government documents in order to get that important government business done. You couldn't just walk down to the local grocery store and buy stamps. You had to have a mechanism for getting your constitutional responsibilities accomplished.

□ 1900

We do that still here today. In these cynical times, Mr. Speaker, I would tell you that I hear most often from folks that they think one of two things is going on with the franking privilege: one, that we are involved in some sort of incumbent protection plan—self-promotion here in this institution, self-glorification—by sending our names out on the front of all of the mail that goes out the door. If not that, I hear the second criticism, which is, ROB, why do Members of Congress get free mail? The Postal Service is in dire straits—free mail for all Members of Congress.

It is not free mail. For every letter that goes out the door that reads ''ROB WOODALL'' up at the top, I get a bill. I get a bill from the United States Postal Service for what a stamp would have cost had I put it on that letter. For every piece of mail that goes out the door with ''ROB WOODALL'' written up at the top, I get a bill from the Postal Service for whatever the bulk rate would have been for the large amounts of mail that I send out the door. It is not free mail for Members of Congress. I want to dispel that myth.

I get all of the emails that I know so many of my colleagues do, which read: ''Go and serve one term in Congress, and get your pension for life.'' Nonsense. Not true. I do get the emails that come in and that talk about the special health care privileges that Congress has and that nobody else can have access to. Come on down, and join the ObamaCare exchange. You can have the same health care privileges that I have. Of all of the myths that go on out there, the myth of free mail continues still today. It is not free mail. We just don't put a stamp on it. Why don't we end this confusion once and for all?

I would like to tell you that this was my brilliant idea—a small idea but my brilliant idea. Not true. We, actually, went down this road in the 1800s. I hold here—Mr. Speaker, you can't read it—an article from The New York Times on March 3, 1875.

It reads:

By a vote of 113–65, the House has concurred in the Senate amendment to the postal appropriations bill partially restoring the franking privilege. The precise extent of this restoration is an allowance of free transmission through the mail on a Congressional frank of the Congressional Record, agricultural reports and seeds, and all public documents now printed or authorized to be printed.

The New York Times, as it is still known for today, goes on to editorialize just a bit:

So far, as our observation goes, there has never been any demand for the restoration of the franking nuisance except on the part of Congressmen. The new men, especially, long for a taste of the sweets of privilege.

This the New York Times in 1875. The ''sweets of privilege'' is how they described the signing of one's name to a constituent's response so you can tell your constituents how it is that you feel about the war in Iraq, so you can tell folks how you feel about the FCC's new regulations, so that you can respond to that young Eagle Scout applicant who wants to get the Citizenship in the Nation merit badge.

We knew in the 1800s that something just didn't seem right about not using stamps like everybody else did. We knew that something didn't feel quite right. For several years, we abolished the franking privilege, and then we brought it back.

I don't have any problem finding stamps, Mr. Speaker. If anybody in this institution has problems finding stamps, I have several local locations that are here by the Capitol. You can send a staffer down to pick up stamps in bulk. For me, I am in the Longworth House Office Building, up on the seventh floor, so I have got to go all the way down to the basement in order to buy my stamps. It is about seven floors away.

They don't do that anywhere else in Washington, D.C. They don't do that. If you are at the IRS and if you need to send out a tax form, you don't sign your name at the top of the letter. If you work over at the Department of Agriculture and if you need to send out a newsletter, you don't sign your name at the top, because everybody else in government uses what is called ''penalty mail.'' It is the same stamp up at the top of a corner that any businessperson would use, that any bulk mail house would use. It is section 3202. It is called ''penalty mail.''

It reads:

Subject to limitations imposed by sections 3204 and 3207 of this title, there may be transmitted as penalty mail official mail of officers of the Government of the United States, the Smithsonian Institution, the Pan-American Union, the Pan-American Sanitary Bureau, the United States Employment Service, and the system of employment offices operated by it in conformity with the provisions of section 4949(c).

Understand that we have a special section in the United States Code that deals with how mail gets out the door, because it is very difficult. We have only been doing it for a couple of hundred years. It requires some special attention from the United States Code, so we have a special section of the Code that allows officers of the Government of the United States, of the Smithsonian Institution, of the Pan-American Union, of the Pan-American Sanitary Bureau, and of the United States Employment Service some special dispensation so they can get mail out the door.

But was that good enough for Congress? The answer is ''no.'' Congress has yet another special exception beyond the special exception, as is highlighted in section A, ''officers of the Government of the United States other than Members of Congress,'' because what we have is our special signature program.

Mr. Speaker, we have got big things we have got to solve in this country—big things we have got to solve. You can't solve those big things when folks believe that you are not telling them the truth about the little things. You have got to build trust with one another. You have got to build trust with one another not just here in this institution but with our constituencies back home; but when people see what they think is free mail that is going out the door, it undermines that trust.

I refer now to the House Manual, Mr. Speaker:

Postal expenses incurred only when the frank is insufficient, such as certified, registered, insured, express, foreign mail, and stamped, self-addressed envelopes related to the recovery of official items, are reimbursable. Postage may not be used in lieu of the frank.

I got to Capitol Hill, Mr. Speaker, and I thought: Do you know what? I know what it is like not to be on Capitol Hill. I am going to go get a bulk mail permit.

They said, No, ROB. You can't get a bulk mail permit to send out mail on Capitol Hill.

I said, Most of what I do isn't bulk mail. I will go buy stamps to send that out.

They said, No, ROB. You can't buy stamps to send out mail. You have to sign your card. You have to put your signature on it. We have to have a special congressional mail privilege for you.

TAMMY DUCKWORTH and I—one Republican, one Democrat—say we can do better than that. It is an election year. Do you know what happens in an election year? The law of the land is: you can't send out mail anymore. If I have a town hall meeting that is going on next week, I couldn't have sent out an invitation last month to have invited you to come meet your Congressman. I couldn't have sent out a newsletter last month to have told you what we were doing with the National Defense Authorization Act. I couldn't have sent out a newsletter last month to have told you about an employment and jobs fair program that was going on, because the law of the land so recognizes this privilege as something that incumbents use to boost their election prospects that it is banned in the 90 days before any election.

So I ask you: If this practice is so offensive that we ban it within 90 days before any election, why don't we just do away with it altogether? If it is so offensive that it must be banned for 180 days out of the year, why don't we do away with it for the other 180 days, too?

I don't need my name on the front of every letter that goes out the door, and I don't need someone to protect me from the challenges of buying stamps; but I have rules in place that prevent postage from being used in lieu of the frank.

I serve on the Budget Committee, Mr. Speaker. I want to balance the Federal budget. We are not going to do it with this bill. I am the lead sponsor of the FairTax. It is the most fundamental reconstruction of our Tax Code that has happened since the income tax came into being in the early 1900s. It is the most prominently cosponsored piece of fundamental tax reform legislation in this body. Those are serious pieces of legislation. This is something minor—this is around the edges—but the National Taxpayers Union has seen fit to say that repealing the so-called ''franking privilege'' is a simple reform to introduce pay-as-you-go budgeting. It is absolutely right. Public Citizen hardly supports the Woodall-Duckworth legislation to rein in the abuse of taxpayer-funded franked mail.

I want to do the big things together, and I want to do the things that matter together. When silly things like this undermine the sacred trust that we have with our constituents, they need to go. Our colleagues who served in this body in the 1870s knew it. They abolished it, but they just couldn't let it go, and they brought it back. Even The New York Times asked: Where was the outcry for free congressional mail? Why was it brought back yet again?

I tried to get this done on my own. I say to my colleagues that I didn't want to waste your time in this way. I tried

to go to the Chief Administrative Office to see if I could just get an exception so I didn't have to send out this mail. I tried to go through the House Administration Committee to see if there was some sort of dispensation so that I could opt out of this system. I tried to go through the Office of the Speaker to see if my MRA could be spent in a different way so I didn't have to perpetuate this. Again, it is a practice that is, apparently, so hideous it is outlawed for 180 days out of the year; but I couldn't get any of those things done.

Now it has come down to us to pass that simple line of code. It is a bipartisan bill—ROB WOODALL, TAMMY DUCKWORTH, a host of other cosponsors. I invite you to join me to abolish the franking privilege. You are welcome to use our hashtag of ''Stop the Frank'' any time you feel like you can move that forward. We are not going to reestablish trust overnight, but with one little accountability action at a time, we can do it. Let's do this little one today. Let's show up again and do another one and tomorrow and do another one and the next day and do another one and the next day and do another one. Then we are going to wake up a year from now or a month from now or a week from now, and we are going to find out that we have really made a difference together.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX), my friend from the Rules Committee.

SKILLS GAP

Ms. FOXX. I thank my colleague from Georgia.

Mr. Speaker, I frequently hear from employers who are struggling to find employees with the right experience and technical skills to meet workforce needs.

The passage of the bipartisan Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act was an important step for the millions of Americans who are looking for work and for the employers who have 5 million-plus job opportunities that remain unfilled due to the skills gap. However, great jobs are still going unfilled. Americans are still missing out on rewarding careers, and many businesses are still suffering.

For example, in the AED Foundation's 2016 Workforce Survey Report, more than 50 percent of equipment distributors indicated that the skills gap hindered company growth and increased costs and inefficiencies while nearly 75 percent said the lack of skilled technicians made it difficult to meet customer demand.

It is imperative that the Department of Labor finalizes regulations for WIOA and that Congress strengthens the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act.

I appreciate very much my friend from Georgia and my colleague on the Rules Committee for yielding to me in order to discuss this important issue to so many of us.

Mr. WOODALL. If my colleagues don't know, one is used to seeing the gentlewoman from North Carolina leading on the Education and the Workforce Committee. All day today, she has been leading on the Rules Committee—chairing those actions that are going on up there. I hoped she was here to file a rule to tell us that that process had been moved right along, but we will have to wait for that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1915

FLOODING IN THE STATE OF TEXAS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN) for 30 minutes.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the subject of my Special Order. That subject, Mr. Speaker, will be flooding in the State of Texas.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I and a good many of my colleagues will speak tonight about circumstances that are occurring in Texas more often than we would care to see. In a sense, Mr. Speaker, this is a continuation of a mission of mercy that we embarked upon earlier this year when we were having flooding in Houston, Texas.

These floods that we are having across the length and breadth of our State are causing great property damage, and that is worthy of a lot of consideration and it is worthy of being addressed on the floor of the House of Representatives. But we also have a good many lives that have been lost across the length and breadth of our State, and these, of course, are of paramount importance to us. So while we may make some references to the property damages and there will be some things said about possible solutions, I believe that we will say a good deal about the lives that have been lost.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas' 27th Congressional District (Mr. FARENTHOLD) to give his comments.

Mr. FARENTHOLD has experienced some flooding, and I am honored to have him appear and tell us about what is happening to his constituents in the 27th Congressional District.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor and a privilege to be here.

A little over a year ago, there were some horrible floods just outside the district I represent in Wimberley, Texas, that took the lives of several constituents vacationing there in Corpus Christi, Texas. In fact, some of the bodies of the young children who perished in that horrible flood have yet to be recovered. My family's prayers and the prayers of the Nation go to those grieving families and the survivors and for the repose of the souls of those who passed.

There has been a lot of flooding in Texas over the past year or so, just as recently as last week. I represent Wharton, Texas. The river in Wharton rose just as it had gotten repairs from the previous flood a few months earlier. All the Sheetrock was newly installed and ready to go; and sure enough, another flood comes and the damage to the property continues.

Unfortunately, the floods of last week and the previous weeks did not result in loss of life in the district that I represent. Thank the Lord for that.

I tell you, in the past 14 months, another county I represent, Bastrop, has experienced the worst flooding it has seen in 35 years. It is currently dealing with $2.5 million in damaged infrastructure, and 20 roads still remain closed today. Of the 100-plus homes damaged in the past 14 months, more than half were determined to be unlivable, and four families still remain in temporary housing.

Earlier, in Wharton County, more than 1,000 people were evacuated and 150 homes flooded. It has really been tough.

I was driving through and visited with the emergency management folks in Wharton. You look at the fields of green. I posted on Instagram the picture of a milo field. It said, ''Amber waves of flooded grain.'' Cotton fields are under water as well.

In addition to the property damage, I think our farmers in Texas may suffer from an overabundance of water. As I grew up in a farming family, our complaint was it either rained too much, too little, or at the wrong time. I will tell you that these floods have just been horrible in Texas.

I do want to thank the folks from FEMA, the Federal Emergency Management Agency, for their quick response.

What it has told us is that we are taking way too much time for projects to stem the flooding, levees and the like, to get approved by the Army Corps of Engineers and the other Federal agencies. The funding for it is difficult to come by.

We end up spending all this money with FEMA. If some of that money were redirected to preventive maintenance or preventing these floods, we might save lives and certainly save property as well. I think it is something that this Congress should look at: preventing problems rather than just reacting to them.

I also want to commend the first responders and the emergency management personnel throughout Texas who have done so much. I also want to offer my thoughts and prayers to those brave servicemen who perished in Texas in the training exercises as well.

It has been a tough few months here back in Texas. But you know what? We are Texans, and we will survive. We will mourn those we have lost, and we will rebuild, and we will continue to reflect that which is the greatest of the American spirit: perseverance through adversity.

I thank Mr. AL GREEN for the opportunity to speak.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FARENTHOLD) for the unity that is engendered by his being here tonight.

It is important for people to know that this is not a time for Democrats or a time for Republicans. This is a time for Texans to come together and to talk about some of the concerns that we have and to remember those who have lost their lives in these floods.

At this time, I am honored to yield to a neighbor who is from the 22nd Congressional District of Texas. He is south of me. Of course, I speak of the Honorable PETE OLSON. We are honored to have him with us tonight, and we welcome your commentary about some of the concerns in your district and, indeed, across the State.

I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. OLSON).

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend and neighbor to the east, Mr. AL GREEN, for holding this very Special Order about floods we have had in Texas.

It has been a rough year in Texas' 22nd Congressional District. Last Memorial Day, we had the 100-year flood and lost one life, one who drove into a flooded small creek and died in their vehicle.

Tax day 2016, there was lots of street flooding. I had to move my pickup truck off my street before it was taken over by the water.

The worst came 2 weeks ago, the 500-year flood. The Brazos River came out of its banks like never before. That river cuts through the heart of my district. It first hit Simonton, a small town in the northwest part of Fort Bend County. They had a mandatory evacuation on May 29. Every home, except for 12, left. Almost all the homes have been flooded.

Next, was Richmond and Rosenberg. Two days after Simonton, they, too, had mandatory evacuations and had homes north of the railroad track flooded.

Next came my hometown of Sugar Land. We had to cancel our Memorial Day celebration because our park was flooded.

Next came Missouri City, Sienna Plantation, floods there. It crossed over Brazoria County and went down to Rosharon, and that place was flooded out as well. Luckily, God willing, we lost no lives these past couple of weeks.

I saw the greatest in Texans this past week. I put 500 miles on my pickup truck in 8 days. At our Fort Bend emergency command operations center, people from all over the region had taken pizza, Chick-fil-A, coffee, Shipley Do-Nuts, kolaches, making sure these people who were working 24/7 are fed.

I saw an old-fashioned cattle drive. Sheriff Troy Nehls led other sheriffs on a cattle drive, moving some cattle down flooded 90, away from the threat of floods.

But the best, my friend, was 2 days ago. My wife, Nancy, and I drove over the river and went down to Rosenberg, Texas, to be with B.F. Terry High School. There was a recovery center giving out goods to people in need. This effort was started by what is called The Church, Second Mile Ministry, and Lamar Consolidated Independent School District, who opened up B.F. Terry High School. Every single day they said, ''We need more rooms. We have to have more space,'' and they got it.

Nancy and I were assigned to stuffing small bags with one roll of toilet paper, a toothbrush, some toothpaste, some shampoo, some soap, and a razor. We were supervised by three young ladies: Rachel, Isabella, and Layla. They were a true team of Texans, my friend. I called Rachel ''the skipper'' because, man, she was in charge. I called Isabella ''the executive officer'' because she was number two in making sure everything worked well. And Layla was ''the weapons officer.'' Don't mess with Layla. I failed my inspection the first two times. I could not get the bag closed. They got on my back and made sure that I closed that bag so people could have all they needed in times of crisis.

That is what makes Texas so great, my friend: not waiting for D.C., but neighbors helping neighbors in need. Those ladies know what the Bible says: love thy neighbor more than thyself.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for not only what he has said tonight, but for what he has been doing in his district to help persons in times of need. It is greatly appreciated by his constituents, and I greatly appreciate you coming to the floor tonight to let people know that we in Texas are standing together, and we are going to work together and we will get through this, but it won't hurt if we can get a little bit of help.

I am honored to have another colleague, who has a district that is in Houston. Of course, he has been in Congress for many years, and I consider him a very dear friend, the Honorable GENE GREEN, from the 29th Congressional District in Houston, Texas.

I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN).

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague and namesake from Houston, Congressman AL GREEN. I appreciate his effort, both on the legislation that we are cosponsors of, but also setting up these Special Orders. It is great to have bipartisan support.

As we found out in Houston, it doesn't matter if you are a Democrat or a Republican. If your house gets flooded, your cars get flooded, in some cases, the lives of your family and your neighbors are in jeopardy, as Texans, we work together.

I have watched this over the years because we have had some terrible floods over the years, whether it be Tropical Storm Allison in 2001, Hurricane Ike in 2008, or what we are seeing now in May of 2015, which we called the Memorial Day flooding that was devastating and included more than 11 inches of rain and $3 billion in damage. But in April of 2016, this year, Houston and areas experienced what we call the devastating tax day flooding on April 18 that claimed lives and caused hundreds of millions of dollars in damage.

In the last 3 weeks, just before Memorial Day, we also have seen historic rainfalls and subsequent flooding. The rain in the Houston area has ceased, but downstream in Brazoria County is my colleague from Fort Bend, just southwest of Houston, the flooding has continued. An estimated 200,000 residents, nearly two-thirds of the population of Brazoria County, have been affected by the flooding. Once again, I stand before this body while southeast Texas is under water.

Once again, I stand with my Houston colleagues and ask the House of Representatives to give our constituents the resources we need to protect lives and property in the future.

I have worked with my colleague, AL GREEN, on H.R. 5025, to appropriate $311 million to complete our bayou system. These projects are not imaginary. They are ideas that would help, and these projects during the process would save lives. These are projects that the Corps of Engineers have said that they have approved. We just don't have the money to complete them.

In the Houston area, we have a number of bayou systems that actually start in Congressman OLSON's, Congressman AL GREEN's, Congressman CULBERSON's, and Congressman MCCAUL's districts. But it runs through my area because I have the eastern side of Harris County, where Buffalo Bayou and the Houston Ship Channel are located. We are downstream from those, and we see that flooding ourselves. I ask the House to bring our bill to the floor and to help mitigate the suffering of these thousands of Texans.

Earlier this month, our office received early notification that the United States is entering hurricane season as of June 1. Once again, the problem could be expanded. Like I said earlier, in 2001, Tropical Storm Allison hit the Texas Gulf Coast and devastated my area of east and north Houston. In 2008, Hurricane Ike caused citywide flooding and hundreds of millions of dollars in damage. Again, it came over our district in east Harris County.

Now we face another hurricane season with the possibility of extended damage and no protection for our vulnerable citizens. Houstonians continue

to suffer the effects of Mother Nature, and we have the ability to help them. The President has declared Houston a disaster area a number of times.

Again, with hurricane season upon us, we would like to see that Congress responds and acts on H.R. 5025 as the best option now.

□ 1930

Again, these are flood control projects that have been approved. We just don't have the money. Of course, in Houston, Harris County, we have a flood control district that we pay our property tax to. They have to come up with a match for the Federal funding, so it is not all Federal funding taking care of our problems. It is actually local folks also paying up to be able to keep our houses and homes from flooding and our families and neighbors from drowning.

Again, I ask my colleagues to support H.R. 5025. I want to thank my colleague, AL GREEN, for his leadership on this. We will continue to ask our colleagues to help even through this hurricane season. It doesn't end until typically the end of October. Again, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. I thank my colleague for coming to the floor. I know a good many of his constituents—he and I are often in each other's districts. I know that they are exceedingly pleased that he has taken up this cause. My hope is that he and I will continue with this mission of mercy, if you will, such that we will bring to fruition some solutions for the problems that we encounter not only in Houston, but also across the length and breadth of our State.

I am honored to yield, Mr. Speaker, to the gentleman from the 20th Congressional District of Texas (Mr. CASTRO), who is in Congress not as a neophyte. I believe he has been here now into his second term. He has done an outstanding job since he arrived in Congress. We are honored to hear from him about some of his concerns and his constituents.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman GREEN for yielding me this time and for organizing tonight's discussion on the devastation our State has seen in recent weeks and months. I know that his city of Houston has experienced truly horrific flooding and destruction, and I offer my condolences to him and to the entire Houston community.

These storms have been severe and deadly. We all mourn the loss of nine soldiers training at Fort Hood whose lives were taken way too soon in floodwaters last week. Six other people across Texas have also died as a result of the storms as well. My prayers are with the families and loved ones of all those whose lives were claimed by this terrible flooding.

Some of the most destructive weather that my hometown, San Antonio, experienced was back in April when three hailstorms struck our city. The Insurance Council of Texas estimates that those storms caused more than $2 billion in damage, and the Council projects $1.93 billion in losses from auto and homeowner claims.

It is not unusual for San Antonio to get a foot of rain by early June each year, but rainfall totals are already double that amount so far in 2016. All of this precipitation is a major economic hit to our city, and it poses a real threat to people's well-being.

I urge folks in San Antonio and across Texas to educate themselves on storm and flood safety. I also encourage Texans who have questions about what help the Federal Government can provide during this trying time to reach out to their Members of Congress. You see a number of us here on the House floor tonight drawing attention to this issue, specifically the issue of flooding in Texas. We are deeply concerned, and we are here to offer any assistance that we can.

I would also say to Congressman GREEN that in addition to what has been the tragic loss of life and the obvious property destruction wrought by these floods, there is also an untold cost in the flooding. I grew up in a few neighborhoods in San Antonio where we didn't have sidewalks, for example.

Often in lower income areas or even in middle-income areas, older parts of the city that don't have sidewalks and don't have the proper infrastructure to deal with even mid-level flooding. People's basements or garages will flood, ruining a lot of property. These are folks who oftentimes are renters or don't have insurance, and so there is really no recourse for them. They end up just paying the price.

It really speaks to the importance of the work that we do, the States do, and the local governments do in making sure that infrastructure is properly built, that it is built across cities and counties, and that flooding is prevented everywhere it can be.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I greatly appreciate the gentleman sharing time with us on the floor tonight. He has spoken very eloquently about some of the concerns that go beyond the visible property damages.

Ostensibly things happen, but there are some other things that are happening that we don't always uncover. When these things happen to poor people, the damages can exceed far more than the eye can see. I am grateful that he has called some of these things to our attention. Thank you very much.

At this time, I am going to call upon another colleague. All of these are dear friends. These are persons who have come to the floor tonight, quite frankly, not in a bipartisan effort, but more in a nonpartisan effort. There is no partisanship associated with what we do. We work together on these issues.

I am honored to yield to the gentleman from the 14th Congressional District, the Honorable RANDY WEBER. He is one of my neighbors as well. I welcome you, and I yield to him, my dear friend.

Mr. WEBER of Texas. I thank my good friend, Congressman GREEN from Houston, for yielding to me. I appreciate that. He is the consummate gentleman. I appreciate him lining this up and helping us to draw attention to it.

Mr. Speaker, all the recent rains in Texas have devastated parts of up to 31 counties in our beloved State. Governor Greg Abbott has declared them a disaster area. I happen to represent the lower half of Brazoria County, from the south side of Alvin going south, and it has been the recipient of a lot of flooding.

On Monday, I toured the Emergency Management Office Command Center in Angleton, Texas, which is the county seat for Brazoria County. I was privileged to meet with County Judge Matt Sebesta and others as I was introduced to the Brazoria County first responders working night and day to take care of our citizens, our citizens' animals and their livestock, and their property as much as we could.

I was also privileged, Mr. Speaker, to go up in a Texas DPS helicopter with two of our great Department of Public Safety pilots. Wow. What devastation, Congressman GREEN, in Brazoria County. I have pictures on my iPhone. I mean, it is just unbelievable the flooded areas. The devastation and destruction is astounding. Waters from the Brazos River, the San Bernard, and other creeks and bayous are out of their banks and wreaking havoc in our area.

Mr. Speaker, I want my constituents to know that our office is already on the ground in the area, already working to ensure that FEMA is in gear, and that our constituents are taken care of. I would like to give a shout out to my great staff, Ms. Dodie Armstrong, Ms. Carmen Galvan, and Jed Webb, who have been on the ground there at the Emergency Management Center monitoring this almost night and day and interfacing with the county to provide them any assistance needed. We have assured Brazoria County that anything we can do, as my good friend JOAQUIN CASTRO was saying, from our end to assist, we would be glad to do that.

Let me just add that we, too, mourn the loss of the Fort Hood soldiers. Our thoughts and prayers go out to them and their families.

Mr. Speaker, we will bounce back from this. Our great Brazoria County first responders are on top of the situation, and our great Brazoria County folks are resilient. I have to say that about Congressman GREEN's Houston constituents as well, our Texas people.

I have lived on the Gulf Coast of Texas almost 63 years. In fact, it will be 63 years this July 2nd coming up. I have seen nothing quite of this magnitude in flooding in our area, but I have seen a lot of hurricanes, a lot of disasters. Texans are a resilient people.

They are going to need our help. They are going to need our prayers. They are going to need some time to heal and get back to business as usual.

I want to say, again, thank you to my good friend, AL GREEN from Houston, for setting this up in a very bipartisan way. We just appreciate that.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the Honorable RANDY WEBER. I especially thank him for signing on early to the legislation that Congressman GENE GREEN called to our attention. I appreciate it greatly. We look forward to working with the gentleman. I thank him for the outstanding effort.

Mr. Speaker, you heard one of our Members mention that we were having 100-year and 500-year floods. This is debatable, I suppose, whether they are 100-year floods or 500-year floods, but there is one fact that is beyond dispute. It is beyond reproach. The fact is this: We are having billion dollar floods. Billion dollar floods, Mr. Speaker, in Houston, Texas.

Within the last year, a little more than a year now, but within a 12-month period of time, Houston, Texas, has been declared a disaster area twice. Twice. Over the last 20 years, billions of dollars spent, and we have had 4 to 5 days of flooding each year over the last 20 years.

This flooding is causing great harm to property. There are people who have just moved back into their homes, Mr. Speaker, and they find themselves now being evicted by floodwaters again, waters that they cannot extricate themselves from. Their homes are stationary and fixed. They have to cope with these floods. They have to cope with their life after the floods. We are here tonight to let the country know that we in Houston, Texas, are tough. We are Texas tough. But there is something that we can do to help the people in Houston, Texas.

I don't want to talk about that right now, to be quite candid with you. After losing the lives of our military persons in Fort Hood, Texas, I believe it is very important for us to make some special reference to them. These are people who have served this country, who were prepared to live and die for the country. They are persons who were in training, and they were among the finest that we have. I regret that we have lost them.

All lives are precious. All lives are special. I came to the floor earlier, and I recited the names of persons who had lost their lives, some 16 persons in the Memorial Day flood and the tax day flood. At this time, I believe it necessary and appropriate to mention the persons who lost their lives in Fort Hood, nine soldiers.

Mr. Speaker, we had a staff sergeant lose his life, Staff Sergeant Miguel Angel Colonvazquez, 38 years of age. Mr. Speaker, he served with honor. He received five Army Commendation Medals and Army Achievement Medals, three Army Good Conduct Medals, two Korea Defense Service Medals, the Army Service Ribbon, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Medal, and other honors as well.

Specialist Yingming Sun, age 25, from California. He received the National Defense Service Medal, the Global War on Terrorism Medal, the Korea Defense Service Medal, the Army Service Ribbon, the Overseas Service Ribbon.

Specialist Christine Faith Armstrong, age 27, from California. She received the National Defense Service Medal, Global War on Terrorism Medal, Korea Defense Service Medal, Army Service Ribbon, and the Overseas Service Ribbon.

Private First Class Brandon Austin Banner, 22 years of age. He received the National Defense Service Medal, Global War on Terrorism Medal, Korea Defense Service Medal, Army Service Ribbon, Overseas Service Ribbon, Marksmanship Qualification Badge.

Private First Class Zachery Nathaniel Fuller, age 23, Floridian. He received the National Defense Service Medal, Global War on Terrorism Medal, Army Service Ribbon.

Private Isaac Lee Deleon, age 19. He received the National Defense Service Medal, Global War on Terrorism Medal, Army Service Ribbon.

Private Eddy Gates, age 20, North Carolina. She received the National Defense Service Medal, Global War on Terrorism Medal, Army Service Ribbon.

Private Tysheena James, age 21. She received the National Defense Service Medal, Global War on Terrorism Medal, Army Service Ribbon.

Finally, Cadet Mitchell Alexander Winey, age 21. He was majoring in Engineering Management at West Point.

Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for the time, and I would like to close with this, if you will allow. All of these people were meeting the measure of life that Ruth Smeltzer called to our attention: Some measure their lives by days and years, others by heartthrobs, passions and tears; but the surest measure under God's sun is what for others in your lifetime have you done.

□ 1945

These were persons who were committed to doing for others in this great country; and they were committed to doing it to the extent that, unfortunately, with all of their honors, they lost their lives in circumstances from which they could not extricate themselves under adverse weather conditions.

I believe that they are worthy of a moment of a silence. They are worthy of much more, to be quite candid with you, but I believe that tonight this House should recognize all of them and all of those who have lost their lives with a moment of silence. And I shall ask that we engage in such at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I would have the families of all of them note that they may be gone physically, but they will never be forgotten. We want the record to show that they served their country with distinction and with honor.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in recognition of the ongoing flooding in my home state of Texas. Texas has experienced numerous incidences of heavy rain and extreme weather events since last summer, which have resulted in extensive flooding, property damage, and tragic loss of life.

Flooding and heavy rain has affected much of our vast state this spring. Flood warnings continue throughout Dallas County along the Trinity River this week, while my district has been the focus of flash flooding and severe weather for the better part of this year. Further throughout Texas, rain gauges at the Austin-Bergstrom International Airport, College Station-Bryan, and San Angelo have recorded the wettest spring seasons on record for these areas.

Recent flooding in Texas has so far claimed the lives of 16 individuals and has resulted in significant costs associated with property damage. Even more alarming is the fact that these catastrophic floods seem to be occurring with greater severity and frequency over time. More than ever, we need to recognize the effects of climate change on our normal weather systems. Before we can begin to seriously address these severe acts of nature, we must trace these events back to their root cause. Climate change is undeniably a significant contributing factor of the increase in frequency and severity of these storms.

The State of Texas has fostered a strong relationship with our federal partners, such as the Department of Homeland Security, to deliver critical funding and emergency response for rescue and clean-up efforts. As long as these floods continue, we need to continue to build on our cooperation and work over the past year by not only improving our response to current events, but also by taking deliberate steps to mitigate future risks.

Mr. Speaker, the extreme weather events that we are experiencing in Texas are emblematic of the potentially devastating consequences of climate change—and this is only the beginning. As we continue our efforts to assist the people of Texas, I urge for more federal assistance in our fight to address the recent rain and flooding while also mitigating future flooding concerns throughout the state.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, on April 17–18, 2016 Houston experienced a historic flood event that claimed the lives of eight people; damaged over 1,150 households; disrupted hundreds of businesses; closed community centers, schools, and places of worship due to flood waters.

On Monday, April 25, I led a tour and held a press conference with the Army Corps of Engineers, local and state elected officials to focus on the damaged caused by the flood and to refocus our efforts on reducing the damage and frequency of flooding in the Houston area.

On April 25, President Obama granted the request for federal Individual Assistance for Harris County residences and business owners who were affected by severe weather and flooding. I would like to thank all the local, state and federal officials who helped in making this possible.

On May 3, 2016, I held a town hall for the residents of Houston, which includes my constituents in the 18th Congressional District so that they could learn from FEMA what resources were available to assist them with recovery.

Unfortunately, that was not the end of the story of flooding in Houston for 2016—in early June another record setting rainfall led to catastrophic flooding throughout the Houston area.

At the beginning of this month Houston once again was flooded and another Disaster Assistance request was submitted to the White House.

I am grateful to the President and the great work of those at the Department of Homeland Security who worked tirelessly to help people after both events.

I spoke on the House Floor several times over the last six weeks about the floods and the suffering caused by the waters that came through our communities—damaging homes, our schools, places of business, and our places of worship.

I am gratified that the House approved my amendments to The Energy and Water Appropriations Act which will help facilitate the $3 million needed to fund the Army Corps of Engineers' Houston Regional Watershed Assessment flood risk management feasibility study.

The Energy and Water Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (H.R. 5055) provides that the Secretary of the Army may initiate up to six new study starts during fiscal year 2017, and that five of those studies are to consist of studies where the majority of the benefits are derived from flood and storm damage reduction or from navigation transportation savings.

My discussion on the House floor about Jackson Lee Amendment with Chairman SIMPSON and Ranking Member KAPTUR of the Energy and Water Appropriations Subcommittee made a compelling case and legislative record that the Houston Regional Watershed Assessment Flood Risk Management Feasibility study is most deserving to be selected by the Secretary of the Army as one of the new study starts.

The Energy and Water Appropriations Act is still under consideration in the House, and I continue to work with my colleagues in moving this important effort forward.

The Houston Regional Watershed Assessment study is critically needed given the frequency and severity of historic-level flood events in recent years in and around the Houston metropolitan area.

The purpose of the Houston Regional Watershed Assessment is to identify risk reduction measures and optimize performance from a multi-objective systems performance perspective of the regional network of nested and intermingled watersheds, reservoir dams, flood flow conveyance channels, storm water detention basins, and related Flood Risk Management (FRM) infrastructure.

Special emphasis of the study, which covers 22 primary watersheds within Harris County's 1,756 square miles, will be placed on extreme flood events that exceed the system capacity resulting in impacts to asset conditions/functions and loss of life.

The Federal government should not run every aspect of our lives—but it is an umbrella on a rainy day—it is a shelter in a powerful storm.

The Federal government is help when no other source of help can meet the challenges we may be facing is sufficient.

It takes all sectors of a community to effectively prepare for, protect against, respond to, recover from, and mitigate against any disaster.

We come together as community—we come together as Houstonians—we come together as Texans and yes—we come together as Americans to provide support, help and assistance to each other during difficult times.

This is a difficult time for many in our city of Houston.

Some of those who were hit hard by the flood are here tonight, but there are many others who suffered losses who were not able to be here.

I ask that you take material with you to share with your neighbors, friends, family, and co-workers who had flood damage or economic impacts due to the flood, but were not able to join us tonight so that they can get the help they may need to recover from the historic flooding.

You may qualify for FEMA Individual Assistance grants of up to $33,000 from the federal government, and low-interest disaster loans from the U.S. Small Business Administration.

An estimated 240 billion gallons of water fell in the Houston area over a 12 hour period, which resulted in several areas exceeding the 100 to 500 year flood event record.

The records on floods are based upon the time period of rain fall, the location of the rain fall, and the duration of the event over a watershed.

The areas that experienced these historic rain falls in April were west of 1–45, north of I–10, and Greens Bayou.

An estimated 140 billion gallons of water fell over the Cypress Creek, Spring Creek, and Addicks watershed in just 14 hours.

The flooding problems in the Houston area are frequent, widespread, and severe, with projects to reduce flood risks in place that are valued at several billion dollars.

Recent historical flooding in the region was documented in 1979, 1980, 1983, 1989, 1993, 1994, 1997, 2001 (Tropical Storm Allison), 2006, 2007, and 2008 (Hurricane Ike).

In 2015, the Houston and surrounding area experienced widespread historic flooding; and again two weeks ago we saw significant flooding damage and loss of life during the 12 hour flood event from April 17–18, 2016.

On June 6, 2016, I held a tour of the flood damage in Houston, Texas with the President and CEO of The American Red Cross Gail McGovern:

Following the flooding in April I worked with FEMA and the city of Houston to provide housing to those left homeless by the flooding in April.

Organized a Houston area delegation letter to appropriators to fund a study.

Sent letters to appropriators on the impact of flooding on the region and requested that a similar effort to deal with storm surge be undertaken for the upper Texas Gulf Coast.

On March 10, 2016, I held what is likely one of the first Congressional events to raise public awareness regarding Zika Virus and to ascertain the needs of local and state agencies who would be responsible for responding to the threat.

On June 1, 2016, CDC reports are there are 1,732 confirmed Zika cases in the continental United States and U.S. Territories.

Cases of the Zika Virus have been reported in every state in the United States except Alaska; Idaho; North Dakota; South Dakota; and Wisconsin.

At that meeting I called for the following directives to happen:

1. Establish a national task force to discuss the Zika virus;

The First meeting of the Task Force occurred on Tuesday, June 7, 2016.

Other objectives that I outlined included:

2. Creation of public service messages explaining what the word DEET means and why it is important to protect yourself with insect repellant;

3. We must make sure that untreated mosquito bed netting is available to women and girls in high risk areas;

4. Post posters in all public hospitals highlighting the dangers of the Zika virus and how one can protect themselves from the Zika virus;

5. Hold a MAJOR briefing in Houston with officials from the CDC regarding the Zika virus;

6. Conduct a Houston/Harris County Public service campaign to inform the community about traveling to Zika Virus mosquito borne infected regions around the world; and

7. We must secure public and private funds to cleanup illegally dumped tires and other debris where mosquitos may breed near people.

We must also rethink how testing is conducted for the Zika Virus.

Dr. Peter Hotez, Dean of the School of Tropical Medicine at Baylor College of Medicine recommends that an aggressive testing and disease surveillance approach be adopted for areas of greatest risk along the Gulf Coast like the city of Houston.

Sub-tropical climate;

Areas of Extreme Poverty;

Presence of the most threatening Zika Virus carrying mosquitoes the Aedes Aegypti;

Mosquito breeding conditions that are supportive of spread of the disease from travelers who come to the Houston area with the illness.

The CDC guidance for persons who seek testing for the disease should allow for greater testing in areas that have these conditions along the Gulf Coast from Texas to Florida.

Mosquito surveillance along the Gulf Coast is not even nor as well-resourced as it once was due to budget cuts and a lack of concern regarding mosquito borne disease, which has greatly reduced capacity and competence in this critical area.

The mosquito that carries Zika Virus is known as the greatest killer of people—it is also known as the yellow fever mosquito.

This Aedes mosquito is the real threat and it must be battled from the neighborhood level up to the county or parish level.

President Obama's request for $1.9 Billion in Zika Virus Emergency Response Funding.

The Senate passed a Zika Virus Appropriations of $1.1 billion, but unfortunately the House only provided $622 million.

The Senate has called for a conference to reconcile the differences between the two bills.

The CDC reported on May 30, 2016, that it has confirmed cases of the Zika Virus include 279 pregnant women in the United States or U.S. Territories.

This number is double the number of cases reported the previous week.

The CDC is reporting all pregnant women who have ''any laboratory evidence'' of possible infection, no matter what.

The CDC made the change after seeing reports of asymptomatic pregnant women—women with no symptoms who delivered children with known Zika Virus birth defects.

These are sobering and troubling numbers this early in our mosquito season.

These cases of Zika Virus include both travel related and those that were contracted from mosquito bites.

The 13 Local Cases of the Zika Virus are all travel related thus far.

Seven cases of the Zika Virus recorded by Harris County Public Health Environmental Services.

Six reported by the City of Houston Public Health Department Reported cases of the Zika Virus.

We know that 4 in 5 people who contract the Zika Virus have no symptoms.

This is especially problematic for pregnant women who may become infected with the Zika Virus and have no symptoms.

Although the contracting of the disease is most associated with mosquitoes it has been transmitted sexually.

This presents other challenges to Zika Virus public education and preparedness.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 46 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 2203

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BYRNE) at 10 o'clock and 3 minutes p.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5278, PUERTO RICO OVERSIGHT, MANAGEMENT, AND ECONOMIC STABILITY ACT

Mr. WOODALL, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 114–610) on the resolution (H. Res. 770) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5278) to establish an Oversight Board to assist the Government of Puerto Rico, including instrumentalities, in managing its public finances, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5325, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2017

Mr. WOODALL, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 114–611) on the resolution (H. Res. 771) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5325) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2017, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. HARDY (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today and the balance of the week on account of a death in the family.

Mr. JEFFRIES (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for June 7 and today.

Mr. PAYNE (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of being in district.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 4 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 9, 2016, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

5627. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulations, Office of the Secretary, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule — Removal of the Equal Employment Opportunity; Policy, Procedures and Programs Regulation [Docket No.: FR-5645-F-01] (RIN: 2501-AD78) received June 7, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

5628. A letter from the Secretary, Division of Corporation Finance, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's interim final rule — Form 10-K Summary [Release No.: 34-77969; File No.: S7-09-16] (RIN: 3235-AL89) received June 3, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

5629. A letter from the Chief Counsel, National Telecommunications and Information Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revision to the Manual of Regulations and Procedures for Federal Radio Frequency Management [Docket No.: 160523450-6450-01] (RIN: 0660-AA32) received June 7, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5630. A letter from the Deputy Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Food Additives Permitted in Feed and Drinking Water of Animals; Chromium Propionate [Docket No.: FDA-2014-F-0232] received June 7, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5631. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's Major final rule — Food Labeling: Revision of the Nutrition and Supplement Facts Labels [Docket No.: FDA-2012-N-1210] (RIN: 0910-AF22) received June 7, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5632. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revisions to Definitions in the Export Administration Regulations [Docket No.: 141016858-6004-02] (RIN: 0694-AG32) received June 3, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5633. A letter from the Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — General Services Administration Acquisition Regulation (GSAR); Rewrite of GSAR Part 515, Contracting by Negotiation [GSAR Case 2008-G506; Docket 2008-0007; Sequence 14] (RIN: 3090-AI76) received June 7, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5634. A letter from the Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — General Services Administration Acquisition Regulation (GSAR); Rewrite of GSAR Part 517, Special Contracting Methods [GSAR Change 71; GSAR Case 2007-G500; Docket No.: 2008-0007; Sequence No.: 3] (RIN: 3090-AI51) received June 7, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5635. A letter from the Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — General Services Administration Acquisition Regulation (GSAR); Purchasing by Non-Federal Entities [GSAR Change 73; GSAR Case 2010-G511; Docket No.: 2014-0008; Sequence No.: 1] (RIN: 3090-AJ43) received June 7, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5636. A letter from the Acting Chief, Unified Listing Team, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Designation of Critical Habitat for the Zuni Bluehead Sucker [Docket No.: FWS-R2-ES-2013-0002; 4500030114] (RIN: 1018-AZ23) received June 7, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5637. A letter from the Acting Chief, Unified Listing Team, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's critical habitat determination — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Determination That Designation of Critical Habitat Is Not Prudent for the Northern Long-Eared Bat [Docket No.: FWS-R3-ES-2016-0052; 4500030113] (RIN: 1018-AZ62) received June 7, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5638. A letter from the Chief, Wildlife Trade and Conservation Branch, Division of Management Authority, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Revision of the Section 4(d) Rule for the African Elephant (Loxodonta africana) [Docket No.: FWS-HQ-IA-2013-0091; 96300-1671-0000-R4] (RIN: 1018-AX84) received June 7, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5639. A letter from the Acting Manager, Unified Listing Team, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Designation of Critical Habitat for the Oregon Spotted Frog [Docket No.: FWS-R1-ES-2013-0088; 4500030114] (RIN: 1018-AZ56) received June 7, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5640. A letter from the Senior Advisor, Office of Offshore Regulatory Programs, Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Oil and Gas and Sulphur Operations in the Outer Continental Shelf — Technical Corrections [Docket ID: BSEE-2016-0006; EEEE500000 16XE1700DX EX1SF0000.DAQ000] (RIN: 1014-AA15) received June 6, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5641. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pollock in Statistical Area 630 in the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 140918791-4999-02] (RIN: 0648-XE504) received June 7, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5642. A letter from the Regulations Coordinator, CMS, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's Major final rule — Medicare Program; Medicare Shared Savings Program; Accountable Care Organizations--Revised Benchmark Rebasing Methodology, Facilitating Transition to Performance-Based Risk, and Administrative Finality of Financial Calculations [CMS-1644-F] (RIN: 0938-AS67) received June 7, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HENSARLING: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 3738. A bill to amend the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act to improve the transparency, accountability, governance, and operations of the Office of Financial Research, and for other purposes (Rept. 114–608). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HENSARLING: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 4638. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to allow for the creation of venture exchanges to promote liquidity of venture securities, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 114–609). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BYRNE: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 770. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5278) to establish an Oversight Board to assist the Government of Puerto Rico, including instrumentalities, in managing its public finances, and for other purposes (Rept. 114–610). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WOODALL. Committee on Rules. House Resolution 771. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5325) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2017, and for other purposes (Rept. 114–611). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. FITZPATRICK (for himself and Ms. SLAUGHTER):

H.R. 5403. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to liability under State and local requirements respecting devices; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK (for himself, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. ZINKE):

H.R. 5404. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to require physicians and physician's offices to be treated as covered device users required to report on certain adverse events involving medical devices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. COHEN (for himself, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. CÁRDENAS, and Mrs. WAGNER):

H.R. 5405. A bill to establish the Stop, Observe, Ask, and Respond to Health and Wellness Training pilot program to address human trafficking in the health care system; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. NOEM (for herself, Mr. ASHFORD, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. CRAMER, and Ms. MCCOLLUM):

H.R. 5406. A bill to amend the Indian Health Care Improvement Act to improve access to tribal health care by providing for systemic Indian Health Service workforce and funding allocation reforms, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. BROWN of Florida:

H.R. 5407. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Labor to prioritize the provision of services to homeless veterans with dependent children in carrying out homeless veterans reintegration programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CICILLINE, and Mr. GUTIÉRREZ):

H.R. 5408. A bill to provide for the treatment and extension of temporary financing of short-time compensation programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HILL:

H.R. 5409. A bill to help individuals receiving disability insurance benefits under title II of the Social Security Act obtain rehabilitative services and return to the workforce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FLORES:

H.R. 5410. A bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to better align the grace period required for non-payment of premiums before discontinuing coverage under qualified health plans with such grace periods provided for under State law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. TONKO, and Ms. MATSUI):

H.R. 5411. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide under the State plan under the Medicaid program early and periodic screening, diagnostic, and treatment services to individuals under age 21 who are receiving services in institutions for mental diseases; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. KILMER (for himself, Ms. STEFANIK, and Ms. DELBENE):

H.R. 5412. A bill to provide the right of American Indians born in Canada or the United States to pass the borders of the United States to any individual who is a member, or is eligible to be a member, of a Federally recognized Indian tribe in the United States or Canada, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALMON:

H.R. 5413. A bill to amend the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 to provide additional requirements for the consumer complaint website of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. UPTON (for himself and Mr. PALLONE):

H.R. 5414. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to provide for establishment of one or more Intercenter Institutes within the Food and Drug Administration for a major disease area or areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY (for herself, Mr. NADLER, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. DELBENE, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Ms. SLAUGHTER):

H. Res. 769. A resolution terminating a Select Investigative Panel of the Committee on Energy and Commerce; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. AL GREEN of Texas (for himself, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. POCAN, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. POLIS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. LEWIS, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. TAKANO, and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN):

H. Res. 772. A resolution encouraging the celebration of the month of June as LGBTQ Pride Month; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

252. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of West Virginia, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 20, urging the United States Congress to provide funding for the West Virginia National Guard to sustain and enhance its capabilities in its role in a regional catastrophe and to modernize the antiquated avionics of its fleet of C130s and other aircraft to meet global airspace requirements for 2020; to the Committee on Armed Services.

253. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Iowa, relative to Senate Resolution 118, calling upon the Congress of the United States, the United States Environmental Protection Agency, the President of the United States, and this country's future President of the United States and administration, to continue to support the RFS in order to encourage American energy production and to strengthen rural communities; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

254. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 119, to recognize May 2016 as ''Amyotrophic Lateral Sclerosis Awareness Month'' and to memorialize the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to provide additional funding for research for the treatment and cure of Amyotrophic Lateral Sclerosis; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

255. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, relative to House Joint Resolution 16-1013, condemning atrocities against Christians and other ethnic and religious minorities; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

256. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 66, memorializing the United States Congress and the Louisiana Congressional Delegation to take such actions as are necessary to rectify the revenue sharing inequities between coastal and interior energy producing states; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

257. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 90, to memorialize the Congress of the United States to designate the Louisiana Highway 8/Louisiana Highway 28 corridor as Future Interstate 14; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

258. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 91, designating Wednesday, April 27, 2016, as the fourth annual Liquefied Natural Gas Day at the state capitol; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Foreign Affairs.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK:

H.R. 5403.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. FITZPATRICK:

H.R. 5404.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 5405.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mrs. NOEM:

H.R. 5406.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Sections 7 and 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Ms. BROWN of Florida:

H.R. 5407.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 5408.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power * * * To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. HILL:

H.R. 5409.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. FLORES:

H.R. 5410.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power * * * To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

H.R. 5411.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. KILMER:

H.R. 5412.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 Clause 18 ''To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper . . .''

By Mr. SALMON:

H.R. 5413.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have Power . . . . To make Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. UPTON:

H.R. 5414.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 188: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York,

H.R. 244: Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. PITTENGER, and Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.

H.R. 250: Mr. BLUM.

H.R. 302: Mr. SCHRADER.

H.R. 379: Mr. GARRETT and Ms. EDWARDS.

H.R. 391: Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. CLYBURN, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. KILDEE, and Ms. PLASKETT.

H.R. 415: Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. TED LIEU of California.

H.R. 448: Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 542: Miss RICE of New York.

H.R. 605: Mr. LOBIONDO.

H.R. 612: Mr. HARDY.

H.R. 711: Mr. THORNBERRY.

H.R. 769: Mr. RENACCI.

H.R. 836: Mr. TROTT and Mr. MARCHANT.

H.R. 921: Mr. BARTON, Mr. ISSA, Mr. DESANTIS, and Mr. BUTTERFIELD.

H.R. 927: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 969: Mr. ROHRABACHER.

H.R. 1062: Mr. BARTON.

H.R. 1130: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 1148: Mr. CHAFFETZ.

H.R. 1151: Mrs. ROBY and Mr. MEEHAN.

H.R. 1197: Mr. LAHOOD.

H.R. 1218: Ms. DELBENE.

H.R. 1258: Mr. GUTIÉRREZ and Mr. KIND.

H.R. 1427: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ and Mr. LOBIONDO.

H.R. 1516: Mr. SHUSTER.

H.R. 1549: Mr. MESSER.

H.R. 1559: Mr. TROTT and Mr. RIGELL.

H.R. 1581: Mr. DESJARLAIS.

H.R. 1603: Mr. POLIQUIN.

H.R. 1652: Mr. MEEHAN.

H.R. 1655: Mr. HECK of Washington.

H.R. 1706: Miss RICE of New York and Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 1717: Mr. ROYCE, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, and Mr. LOBIONDO.

H.R. 1845: Mr. ASHFORD.

H.R. 1860: Mrs. HARTZLER.

H.R. 1904: Mrs. DINGELL.

H.R. 1905: Mrs. DINGELL.

H.R. 2411: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 2434: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 2500: Mr. SARBANES and Mr. ALLEN.

H.R. 2513: Mr. THORNBERRY.

H.R. 2698: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.

H.R. 2737: Mr. NADLER, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. COLE, Mr. JOYCE, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. TONKO, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. BOUSTANY, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. RUIZ, and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 2739: Mr. DOLD, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. FOSTER, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 2752: Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 2759: Mr. SHIMKUS.

H.R. 2889: Mr. TAKANO and Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 2903: Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. DENHAM, and Mr. BUTTERFIELD.

H.R. 2911: Ms. TITUS.

H.R. 2992: Mr. ROKITA, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. COLE, Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. HANNA, and Miss RICE of New York.

H.R. 3094: Mr. ZINKE, Mrs. LUMMIS, and Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.

H.R. 3099: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MACARTHUR, and Mr. CURBELO of Florida.

H.R. 3180: Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 3222: Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 3235: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN and Mr. MEEHAN.

H.R. 3238: Mr. PAULSEN.

H.R. 3255: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 3268: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.R. 3316: Ms. DELBENE.

H.R. 3535: Mr. PETERS.

H.R. 3539: Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 3580: Mr. RYAN of Ohio and Mr. BISHOP of Utah.

H.R. 3632: Ms. DUCKWORTH.

H.R. 3720: Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 3765: Mr. LUCAS.

H.R. 3799: Mr. RUSSELL.

H.R. 3861: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.

H.R. 3880: Mr. RENACCI.

H.R. 3957: Mr. NUGENT.

H.R. 4013: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 4019: Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 4061: Mr. LANGEVIN.

H.R. 4247: Mr. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, and Mr. PEARCE.

H.R. 4262: Mr. BILIRAKIS and Mr. LATTA.
H.R. 4352: Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia, and Mr. SESSIONS.
H.R. 4365: Mr. LABRADOR and Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.
H.R. 4381: Mr. ALLEN.
H.R. 4424: Mr. HUNTER.
H.R. 4435: Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, and Mr. LYNCH.
H.R. 4469: Mr. CHABOT, Mr. ZINKE, Mr. ISSA, and Mr. ROE of Tennessee.
H.R. 4481: Mr. KILMER and Mr. DESJARLAIS.
H.R. 4488: Mr. LYNCH.
H.R. 4559: Mr. BARTON, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mr. MULLIN.
H.R. 4567: Mrs. WAGNER.
H.R. 4585: Ms. HAHN and Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 4625: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 4626: Mr. LUCAS, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. COSTA, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. WITTMAN.
H.R. 4646: Mr. ENGEL, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, and Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 4653: Mr. O'ROURKE and Ms. DELBENE.
H.R. 4662: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. CLARKE of New York, and Mr. CÁRDENAS.
H.R. 4665: Mr. ROSS and Mr. WALZ.
H.R. 4695: Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. DELAURO, and Mr. LANGEVIN.
H.R. 4708: Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania and Mr. GRAYSON.
H.R. 4764: Mr. BILIRAKIS.
H.R. 4768: Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. CRAMER.
H.R. 4773: Mr. KELLY of Mississippi and Mr. CARTER of Texas.
H.R. 4795: Mr. HECK of Washington.
H.R. 4798: Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania and Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 4817: Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, and Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 4854: Mr. SCHWEIKERT.
H.R. 4855: Mr. SCHWEIKERT.
H.R. 4918: Ms. DELAURO and Mr. TONKO.
H.R. 4931: Ms. DELAURO.
H.R. 4989: Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 5025: Mr. O'ROURKE.
H.R. 5044: Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. TAKAI, Mr. HOYER, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. RUSH, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. NEAL, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. NOLAN, and Mr. HERA.
H.R. 5051: Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. POLIS, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. PETERS, Mr. CARNEY, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. COOPER, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, and Mr. ISSA.
H.R. 5082: Mr. KING of New York, Mr. DUFFY, and Mr. BARR.
H.R. 5135: Mr. BOUSTANY.
H.R. 5166: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, and Mr. PETERSON.
H.R. 5177: Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 5180: Mr. MARCHANT and Mr. HUDSON.
H.R. 5182: Mr. CONNOLLY.
H.R. 5190: Mr. FARENTHOLD.
H.R. 5203: Mr. BARLETTA.
H.R. 5207: Mr. DEUTCH and Mr. KEATING.
H.R. 5210: Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, and Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 5224: Mr. WITTMAN and Mr. GIBBS.
H.R. 5254: Mr. KEATING, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. MOORE, Mr. POCAN, and Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.
H.R. 5258: Mr. KELLY of Mississippi.
H.R. 5272: Ms. ESHOO, and Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 5275: Mr. LUETKEMEYER.
H.R. 5285: Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. TIBERI.
H.R. 5292: Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. HURD of Texas, Mr. LONG, Mr. FLORES, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. KIND, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. GIBBS, and Mr. MEEHAN.
H.R. 5294: Mr. GIBBS and Mr. KELLY of Mississippi.
H.R. 5307: Mr. PEARCE, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. GOHMERT, and Mr. KELLY of Mississippi.
H.R. 5319: Mr. GIBBS.
H.R. 5320: Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. LATTA, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. ISSA, and Mr. MEEHAN.
H.R. 5340: Miss RICE of New York.
H.R. 5351: Mr. BYRNE.
H.R. 5361: Mr. RENACCI.
H.R. 5362: Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico.
H.R. 5368: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 5369: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 5386: Mrs. DINGELL.
H.R. 5400: Mr. RANGEL.
H.J. Res. 48: Mr. CONYERS.
H. Con. Res. 19: Mr. BARR and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H. Con. Res. 128: Mr. LAMALFA.
H. Con. Res. 132: Mrs. DINGELL and Mr. TAKANO.
H. Res. 494: Ms. GRANGER and Mr. ROUZER.
H. Res. 590: Mr. COFFMAN and Mr. LIPINSKI.
H. Res. 617: Mr. MICA.
H. Res. 625: Mr. MEEHAN and Mr. CALVERT.
H. Res. 650: Mr. HUNTER.
H. Res. 660: Mr. MCCAUL and Ms. KELLY of Illinois.
H. Res. 667: Mr. MEEHAN.
H. Res. 668: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
H. Res. 703: Mr. LANGEVIN.
H. Res. 712: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.
H. Res. 729: Mr. KILMER, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. WALBERG, Mrs. ROBY, Mr. STEWART, Mr. MULVANEY, and Mr. WEBSTER of Florida.
H. Res. 730: Mr. POLIQUIN.
H. Res. 750: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. SCHIFF, and Miss RICE of New York.
H. Res. 759: Mr. COSTA.
H. Res. 766: Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BECERRA, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DEUTCH, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. HIGGINS, Ms. NORTON, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. KEATING, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KILMER, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. SABLAN, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. BORDALLO, and Mr. JEFFRIES.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

The amendment to be offered by Representative ROB BISHOP, or a designee, to H.R. 5278, the Puerto Rico Oversight, Management, and Economic Stability Act, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 162 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JUNE 8, 2016 *No. 90*

Senate

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Almighty God, who blesses us beyond what we deserve, we place our trust in You. Because of You, our future is brighter than we can imagine. Thank You for Your unfailing love and compassion, which You have shown from long ages past.

Continue to protect our Nation and world. Lord, give our lawmakers the grace to cherish and cultivate the virtues and values that make a nation great. Save our Senators from those transgressions that bring national ruin. May they keep ever before them Your vision for the people they serve and strive to leave the world better than they found it.

We pray in Your great Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAUL). The majority leader is recognized.

ZIKA VIRUS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, we all agree that the Zika virus is a real threat and needs to be addressed. Republicans and Democrats worked together to pass a bill here in the Senate to provide funding and resources. The House passed its own version. We are now ready to go to conference and complete a final bill. I will have more to say on that soon, but I appreciate the hard work of Members on both sides of the aisle in crafting the Senate's response.

FRANK R. LAUTENBERG CHEMICAL SAFETY FOR THE 21ST CENTURY ACT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, after months of hard work and collaboration between both Chambers, last night we were able to pass the first major environmental reform bill in two decades. I know Bonnie Lautenberg has waited for this day for a very long time. The Lautenberg act bears her husband's name and will go a long way toward modernizing our Nation's chemical safety regulations. It will look out for public safety, enhance transparency, and help support manufacturing and our economy. It is good legislation that languished for years until a new Senate majority made it a renewed priority. I want to thank Senators INHOFE and VITTER for all their work with Senators UDALL and MARKEY to move this important measure forward. Its passage represents the latest example of how the Senate is back to work for the American people.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION BILL

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, on another important matter, the issue before us today, there are an array of threats facing our country. As the chairman of the Armed Services Committee recently observed, ''[I]nstead of one great power rival, the United States now faces a series of trans-regional, cross-functional, multi-domain, and long-term strategic competitions.''

There are the conventional military challenges, such as adversaries who have been developing and modernizing their missiles, airframes, ships, and ground forces; there are the asymmetric threats, such as cyber warfare, propaganda, and espionage; and there are nations, such as China, Iran, and Russia, which represent both conventional and asymmetric threats at the very same time.

If we are going to keep Americans safe, we have to prepare for all of these challenges. We have to modernize our defenses, keep up with technological advances, and recognize threats. Passing the National Defense Authorization Act before us would put our country on the path to doing these things. It is a reform bill that will encourage defense innovation. It is a forward-looking bill that will upgrade our missile defenses and modernize our military equipment. It is a responsible bill that will ensure that America's men and women in uniform receive more of the resources they need to confront the challenges of today and the threats of tomorrow.

As I have said before, we should use the remaining months of the Obama administration to prepare the next administration, whether Republican or Democratic, for the variety of challenges it will inherit. These are complex challenges without simple answers. Passing a pro-reform, pro-innovation, pro-modernization defense bill such as this one will leave us better equipped to solve them. It will leave us better equipped to keep Americans and our allies safe in the face of ever-evolving security challenges.

WELCOMING THE PRIME MINISTER OF INDIA

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, later today we will welcome the Prime Minister of India as he visits the Capitol. Although this is Narendra Modi's fourth trip to the United States as Prime Minister, it marks the first time he will address a joint meeting of Congress. It also marks the fifth time an Indian Prime Minister has done so

since the 1980s. It shows how far our relationship has come in recent decades. Mutual misgivings have given way to mutual benefits in both the economic and security spheres. We are now key trading partners. We are the two largest democracies in the world. Our relationship is an important one, and there are more benefits that can be shared from future cooperation.

Today's address by Prime Minister Modi provides an important opportunity for all involved—an opportunity to hear his perspective on India's economic growth and how he feels we can strengthen the strategic partnership between our countries, an opportunity to learn more about his ideas for pursuing areas of common ground and advancing shared interests, and an opportunity to better understand his view of the challenges currently facing India and his outlook for overcoming them.

We welcome Prime Minister Modi. We are interested in learning more about his vision, both for India and for the country's continued partnership with the United States in the years ahead.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority leader is recognized.

WELCOMING THE PRIME MINISTER OF INDIA

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I join the Republican leader in welcoming the Prime Minister from India to America.

Mr. President, in my office I have a wonderful memento of my first meetings with Indians. I went to school at Utah State University in Logan, UT. It was so cold. My wife and I lived off campus, and we would drive a couple miles up a hill to the Utah State campus. Along the way, I would see Indian students walking to school. They were engineering students and agricultural students at the college. I would give them rides. I did that for a couple of years.

When it came time for me to graduate, one of the Indians I had gotten to know asked if Landra and I would be willing to stay over an extra day and they would make us a traditional Indian feast. We did that. It was a feast. They were dressed in their Indian garb. They had worked a lot on that food. It was the first Indian food we had eaten. We have eaten a lot of it since. It was a wonderful, warm occasion that we will always remember.

They gave us some presents, and with five children and moving quite a bit, most of those presents are history. I don't know what they were. But one that I have always protected is a little bone-carved statue of Gandhi that they gave me. He is in his regular clothes that we see him in. He has a staff in his hand like he had most of the time. It is finely carved. You can pull that staff out even today. It is a miracle that it made it through my five children, but I have done everything I could to protect it. Now I have it in my office in a little glass enclosure, and I show my Indian guests that meaningful memento of mine.

The other reason I am going to have the opportunity in an hour or so to meet with the Prime Minister with Senator MCCONNELL, the Speaker, and Leader PELOSI—I hope I have the opportunity to tell him of my fondness for Indians but especially those named Modi because the spokesperson's name from the group of Indians that I met was Modi. I have come to the realization in recent years that that was his last name. Everybody called him Modi. He was an engineer. He moved to New Jersey, and we kept in touch.

I am happy that the Prime Minister is going to be able to address our Nation in the House of Representatives, and I am sure his people look forward to that.

Again, I tell everyone here about my warmness for India, this great democracy. The second largest Muslim population in the world is in India. So it is a friend that we have, and we must maintain that friendship.

ZIKA VIRUS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I just left a meeting, a stunningly important meeting where every one of the guests were prominent, but the two I want to refer to briefly are Dr. Frieden, head of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, and Dr. Fauci, head of one of the health institutes at the National Institutes of Health, Infectious Diseases, among other things. What they told us was very frightening. As we speak, there are three confirmed cases of babies born in the United States with the Zika virus. Of course, they are all very sick. The life expectancy is not very long.

They said in unison how vitally important it is and has been for months to get them some money so they can do the research needed to stop the spread of this virus. They have borrowed money from malaria research, TB research—all terribly difficult problems we are having in the world and the United States—to take care of the immediate funding for research on Zika. They have taken huge amounts of money—more than half a billion dollars—out of the Ebola fund, which is still a very serious problem. There are active cases as we speak.

This is not an effort we can just walk away from. This money has been needed for a long time, and it is sad that the Presidential request of $1.9 billion has been opposed.

The senior Senator from Florida was at the meeting today talking about how every day there are new cases in Florida. Yesterday there were five new ones. We needed to do something on that yesterday, not wait until the fall, as has been suggested by my Republican colleagues.

DONALD TRUMP AND FILLING THE SUPREME COURT VACANCY

Mr. REID. Mr. President, Senate Republicans are waiting with gleeful anticipation for Donald Trump to fill the vacancy on the Supreme Court. Donald Trump, who last week attacked a Federal judge because of his Mexican heritage—even though the judge was born in Indiana—said that District Judge Curiel shouldn't be allowed to preside on his case because of his ethnicity. Donald Trump, moments later, said that he would feel the same way if the judge were Muslim.

This is the man—Donald Trump—for whom Senate Republicans are blocking a supremely qualified nominee for the Supreme Court, a man by the name of Merrick Garland. This is the man—Donald Trump—for whom Republicans are abdicating their constitutional responsibility. This is the man—Donald Trump—whom Senate Republicans want to determine the makeup of the Supreme Court for at least the next generation.

The Senate Republicans are united in blocking Judge Merrick Garland's nomination to the Supreme Court. Republicans are united in refusing to provide their advice and consent to President Obama's nominee to the Supreme Court. The Republicans are united in doing it for Donald Trump. They say so. They should be ashamed.

It is hard to imagine anything more humiliating than holding a Supreme Court seat open so that Donald Trump can fill that seat. Is this why my Republican colleagues entered public service—to march in lockstep behind a man who spews hate and attacks the basic rule of law in America?

The Republican leader says: ''We know that Donald Trump will make the right kind of Supreme Court appointments.''

This is sad for the Republican Party. If my Republican colleagues aren't embarrassed, they aren't thinking very well.

President Obama has nominated a moderate, experienced, brilliant jurist to the Supreme Court, but instead of giving Judge Garland the impartial treatment he deserves, Republicans are refusing to do their jobs. And for what? So Donald Trump, a man who routinely insults Republican Senators to their faces, among others, denigrates Senator MCCAIN's heroism, says people's heritage makes them unable to perform their jobs, and all the terrible stuff about women, handicapped people—we want this man to appoint someone to the Supreme Court? The Republicans should come to their senses. It is time to drop the charade and give Garland a fair hearing and a vote.

AMENDMENT NO. 4549

Mr. REID. Mr. President, on another subject, Americans share many common values, and one of the most fundamental is this: If you make a commitment, you should keep it. If you reach

an agreement, abide by it. Simply put, a promise is a promise. Unfortunately, the pending amendment from the chairman of the Armed Services Committee would undermine this basic tenet.

Last year, Democrats and Republicans made an agreement. Democrats were committed to helping the middle class. Republicans were focused only on the Pentagon. Ultimately, we reached a compromise that was based on the principle of parity. We want to help the military, and they should be helped, but there should also be help for programs that are also important for our national security that are not the Pentagon. We provided additional resources to the Pentagon, as I said, but we also provided the same level of help for the middle class. That included improving our security through efforts of domestic agencies like the FBI, Drug Enforcement Administration, Department of Homeland Security, and others. That was our agreement, but now some Republicans want to break their word. Senate Republicans are demanding billions more from the Pentagon but refuse to provide an extra penny for the middle class, and that is wrong. It is completely inconsistent with last year's agreement, and it is blind to the many serious needs here at home that Republicans continue to ignore, and Zika is one. That is why I support the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island, JACK REED, along with the leader we have on the Appropriations Committee, BARBARA MIKULSKI.

The Reed-Mikulski amendment would provide the same extra support for our middle class that Senator MCCAIN is demanding for the Pentagon, and it recognizes that our security depends on more than just the Defense Department. The Reed amendment includes more funding to address the dangerous Zika virus and fight the scourge of opioids. It also would help mitigate lead contamination, which is long overdue, in Flint, MI.

This amendment strengthens domestic security through support of the FBI and the Department of Homeland Security. It will improve airport security and community policing, and it will address the threat of cyber crime and terrorism.

The amendment by the Senator from Rhode Island and the Senator from Maryland will create jobs and address our Nation's crumbling infrastructure. It will not only improve our transportation system but medical facilities for our veterans and our National Park System.

The Reed amendment is also an investment in our future. The legislation will promote science and innovation through support for the National Institutes of Health, National Science Foundation, among others, and it will support education.

I urge my colleagues to support this important proposal which will make America a better and stronger country.

The bottom line is this: A promise is a promise. The middle class needs help at least as much as the Pentagon. Republicans should keep their promise to hard-working American families.

I yield the floor.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2017

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 2943, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2943) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

Pending:

McCain amendment No. 4229, to address unfunded priorities of the Armed Forces.

Reed/Mikulski amendment No. 4549 (to amendment No. 4229), to authorize parity for defense and nondefense spending pursuant to the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2015.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

AMENDMENT NO. 4549

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I rise to discuss my amendment, which will provide partial relief from the caps imposed by the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2015 on both the defense and nondefense portions of the budget for fiscal year 2017. The chairman has offered an amendment that will provide relief for the Department of Defense activities. My amendment will provide a comparable amount of relief for activities that are beyond the Department of Defense but critical to our national security and critical to our national economy.

It is long past time to replace the senseless sequester with a balanced approach that keeps America safe and strong at home and abroad. Senator MCCAIN and I both believe that sequestration has to be eliminated. What I would suggest is that it has to be done in a balanced way. It has to keep the intent of the Bipartisan Budget Act and the Budget Control Act by treating defense and nondefense spending equally.

Let me also be clear. The bill before us provides the amount outlined under current law as well as the budget request of the Secretary of Defense who, along with the Service Secretaries and Chiefs, has testified in support of this amount. They certainly would like more, but they have testified that for this year these resources are at least adequate. Now they have also made it very clear that if we do go into sequestration in the next year, it would be absolutely devastating to the Department of Defense. As a result, we share—the chairman and I—the same commitment to ensuring that sequestration is eliminated and we move to a more rational budget process.

These military professionals would like to have the certainty of year-long funding at the committee level reported at least. That certainly is extremely important. I don't think they want to roll the dice. They recognize that this lengthy fight for parity could last all the way through this year. I believe what they would like to see us do is what they said in their testimony. We can operate under the budget as proposed by the President, as recognized in the underlying budget committee mark, and that will give us the certainty we need.

The bill reported out of the Senate Armed Services Committee includes $523.9 billion in discretionary spending for defense base budget requirements and $58.9 billion for overseas contingency operations, or OCO account. It includes $19.3 billion for Department of Energy-related activities resulting in a top-line funding level of approximately $602 billion for discretionary national defense spending.

While these funding levels adhere to the spending limits mandated by the Bipartisan Budget Act, or BBA, concerns have rightly been raised that the Department may require additional resources to carry out the missions it has been assigned and to adequately maintain the readiness of our military forces. As my colleagues are aware, when the Senate considered the BBA last fall, it established the discretionary funding level for defense spending for fiscal year 2017. That agreement passed this Chamber with support from Senators from both political parties. Furthermore, the BBA split the increase in discretionary spending evenly between the defense and nondefense categories.

It is important to remember that we have repeatedly made incremental changes to the discretionary budget caps for both defense and nondefense accounts. We have done so in order to provide some budgetary certainty to the Department of Defense and our domestic agencies. These spending caps were first revised with the American Taxpayer Relief Act of 2012, the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013, and most recently with the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2015.

In each instance, bipartisan majorities in Congress voted to increase the spending caps and provide additional resources, evenly split between defense and nondefense accounts. Unfortunately, providing relief to the budget caps for defense spending, as the underlying amendment by the chairman proposes, while taking no action on nondefense spending, would renege on those bipartisan agreements and the sense of common purpose that motivated us in the last several adjustments to the Sequestration Act.

In contrast, my amendment, would keep the pressure on for a permanent

solution to the budget caps and sequestration by treating defense and nondefense discretionary funding equally. We can't afford to miss any opportunity to make progress on this issue of sequestration relief. It also reinforces and underscores the sense of the Senate passed by the committee that states ''sequestration relief should include both defense and nondefense relief.'' Again, that is a concept that has motivated all of us or the vast majority for many years.

Specifically, my amendment would revise the budget caps to allow for an additional $18 billion in nondefense and defense-focused domestic spending to match the additional $18 billion in defense spending.

The additional nondefense funds are intended primarily to help address security challenges facing our Nation that do not fall within the purview of the Department of Defense, including funds to implement the integrated campaign plan to counter ISIL, enhance Federal cyber security, and provide additional resources for border security, first responders, counternarcotics, refugee assistance, Zika prevention and treatment, and infrastructure security and vulnerabilities.

True national security involves more than just the activities of DOD, and so non-DOD departments and agencies should also receive relief from the budget caps. The Pentagon simply cannot meet the complex set of national security challenges we face without the help of other government departments and agencies, including State, Justice, and Homeland Security.

There is a symbiotic relationship between the DOD and other civilian departments and agencies that contributes to our national security. It has to be recognized that providing security for the American people requires a truly whole-of-government approach that goes beyond just a strong DOD.

The budget caps are based on a misnomer, that discretionary spending is divided into security and nonsecurity spending. But Members need to be clear, essential national security functions are performed by government departments and agencies other than the Department of Defense.

As retired Marine Corps General Mattis said, ''If you don't fund the State Department fully, then I need to buy more ammunition.'' General Mattis's point is perhaps best illustrated in the administration's nine lines of effort to counter ISIL. Of these nine lines of effort, only two fall squarely within the responsibilities of the Department of Defense and intelligence communities; i.e., traditional security activities. The remaining seven elements of our counter-ISIL strategy fall primarily on the State Department and other civilian departments and agencies.

My amendment includes $1.9 billion to support this counter-ISIL strategy, including supporting effective governance in Iraq. No amount of military assistance to the Government of Iraq will be effective in countering the ISIL threat in Iraq if the Abadi government doesn't govern in a more transparent and inclusive manner that gives Sunnis hope that they will participate politically in Iraq's future. We need our diplomatic and political experts at the State Department to engage with Sunni, Shia, Kurd, and minority communities in Iraq to promote reconciliation in Iraq and build the political unity among the Iraqi people needed to defeat ISIL. Those resources will come through the State Department, primarily.

Building partner capacity. The coalition is building the capabilities and capacity of our foreign partners in the region to wage a long-term campaign against ISIL. While the efforts to build the capacity of the Iraqi security forces and some of our other foreign partners are funded by the Department of Defense, the State Department and USAID are also responsible for billions of dollars in similar activities and across a broader spectrum of activities. Under the underlying amendment, none of the State and USAID programs will receive additional funding for these purposes.

We have to disrupt ISIL, particularly their finances. Countering ISIL's financing requires the State Department and Treasury Department to work with their foreign partners and the banking sector to ensure our counter-ISIL sanctions regime is implemented and enforced. These State- and Treasury-led efforts are nonsecurity in the very simple dichotomy that has been drawn under the budget caps. It is also notable that the Office of Foreign Asset Control, OFAC, and the Office of Terrorism and Financial Intelligence, TFI, Treasury Department, are also categorized as nonsecurity activities under the budget caps. The Republican funding strategy not only means that our counter-ISIL efforts will be hampered, so, too, will our efforts to effectively impose sanctions against Iran, Sudan, and individuals who support their illicit activities.

We also have to continue to expose ISIL's true nature. Our strategic communications campaign against ISIL requires a truly whole-of-government effort, including the State Department, Voice of America, and USAID. The Republican approach to funding our strategic communications strategy is a part-of-government plan, not a whole-of-government plan, since the additional funds that could be used by State, USAID, Voice of America, and other agencies would not be there.

We have to stop the flow of foreign fighters. Foreign fighters are the lifeblood of ISIL. Without the efforts of our diplomats around the world prodding our foreign partners to pass laws and more effectively enforce the laws on their books, the efforts of the coalition to stem the flow of foreign fighters will never be successful.

Of course, we have to protect the homeland. While a small portion of the Department of Homeland Security is considered security-related activities under the budget caps, the vast majority of the Department falls into the nonsecurity portion of the budget. Providing no relief from the budget caps to the Department of Homeland Security shortchanges efforts to secure our communities and borders against ISIL threats.

Again, we have to provide support because of the huge humanitarian crisis that causes instability worldwide, particularly in areas of concern. Virtually none of the activities that support our humanitarian efforts in the region—in the Middle East and many other parts of the world—are considered security activities. Military commanders routinely state that the efforts of the State Department, the USAID, and the Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance to provide for refugees and other vulnerable populations overseas are critical to our broader security efforts, and that is particularly true on the counter-ISIL campaign.

The administration's two remaining lines of effort against ISIL—namely, denying ISIL safe havens and enhancing intelligence collection—are under the so-called defense or security accounts. However, the continued presence and activities of our diplomats overseas significantly enable both of these lines of effort. Therefore, our amendment would also authorize additional funds to provide for improved Embassy security to help keep these personnel safe.

The importance of adequately funding other security-focused civilian departments and agencies was also underscored by the former commander of U.S. Northern Command ADM William Gortney when he testified before the Senate Armed Services Committee earlier this year. Admiral Gortney stated:

> Our trusted partnerships are our center of gravity and are critical to our success across the spectrum of our missions. Homeland partnerships . . . underscore every one of our mission areas, and are best represented by the integration in our headquarters of nearly 60 DOD and non-DOD federal agencies, department representatives, and liaison officers. I view homeland defense as a team effort, and I rely on partnerships with my fellow combatant commands, the Services, and our interagency partners to accomplish this mission.

Recognizing this reality, my amendment also includes additional funding for critical domestic security efforts, including $2 billion for cyber security. Cyber attacks are a real threat to our national security. Cyber threats are increasing as our country and government become more digitally connected. There is no question the Federal Government must do a better job of protecting its systems. This amendment provides an additional $2 billion to address our cyber security vulnerabilities in nondefense agencies.

I was particularly struck in hearings we had with the Department of Transportation IG and Department of Housing IG. When asked to give their major

concerns, both indicated the potential for cyber attacks and cyber security within their Departments. So this issue of cyber security certainly transcends the Department of Defense, and funding cyber security is a critical primary objective included in the amendment that I propose.

We are also asking for $1.4 billion for law enforcement and the Department of Homeland Security. This money will help State and local law enforcement and first responder efforts. It will also allow the Department of Homeland Security to hire 2,000 new Customs and Border Protection officers and reduce wait times and improve security.

It is a good sign for our economy that more and more people have been using air travel since the economic recovery started in 2009. We have seen, particularly at many of our larger airports, passengers experiencing significant delays trying to clear security. For instance, BWI Airport is advising passengers to show up 2 hours early for domestic flights in order to clear security. The flight to Providence is 1 hour 15 minutes, and I take it often. So it is possible that people flying to Rhode Island will spend more time in the security lines than on the plane. We all know how much that affects the people we represent.

It is also important we have an adequate number of Customs officers not only at the southern border but all ports of entry across the country. T.F. Green Airport in my home State has a growing international service, but it has become a challenge for the existing number of Customs agents and inspectors to meet new demands for service.

One of the areas we talked about extensively on both sides of the aisle over the last several months has been the opioid epidemic. The amendment I propose would provide resources in the amount of $1.1 billion to help with this epidemic. In the United States, drug overdoses have exceeded car crashes as the No. 1 cause of injury death. Two Americans die of drug overdoses every hour. In my State of Rhode Island, there were more than 230 opioid overdose deaths in 2014. We acted earlier this year on the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act to help deal with this issue, but so far the funding efforts have been blocked. So we have a situation where there is authority but no funds. I think we need both, and I think we have to continually ensure we have both authorities and funds. It is critical that we provide real resources to States and local entities to confront this epidemic and to ensure that people have access to the treatments they need.

Another issue which threatens our national security that is not a traditional Department of Defense issue by any means is the threat of the Zika virus. It is on every front page and on every news show at almost every moment. This legislation would authorize $1.9 billion for Zika prevention and treatment.

The threat of the Zika virus is a serious public health issue. It has been over 2 months since the administration asked for funds to speed up the development of vaccines and for a comprehensive response to the Zika virus. This should not be a partisan issue, and continued inaction leaves us more susceptible to this serious public health emergency. Already, there are over 1,700 cases of the Zika virus in the United States and U.S. territories, including over 300 involving pregnant women. We have seen seven cases so far in my home State of Rhode Island. The virus is spreading. It is not going away on its own, and we will certainly see these numbers increase as we approach the summer months. Again, I think we have to see this as a threat to our national security and deal with it as we are trying to deal with other threats to national security.

But our national security is not just about being strong abroad, it is also being strong at home. A growing, vital economy allows us to meet the fiscal challenges we need to fully fund defense and to fully fund our nondefense security activities. So, as Secretary Carter has said, underfunding the nondefense portion of the budget, in his words, ''disregards the enduring long-term connection between our Nation's security and many other factors. Factors like scientific R&D to keep our technological edge, education of a future all-volunteer military force, and the general economic strength of our country.''

The words of the Secretary of Defense, I think, are right on target. Furthermore, the men and women of our military volunteer to protect and are fighting overseas for American ideals, including a good education, economic opportunity, safe communities, and functioning infrastructure. There is a reason why our past budget agreements have provided budget parity between defense and nondefense spending. We have done so because we all recognize that we must protect our Nation as well as keep our Nation worth protecting.

Our servicemembers and their families also rely on many of the services provided by non-DOD departments and agencies. Efforts to support all these goals will be hampered unless civilian departments and agencies also receive relief from the budget caps.

Therefore, my amendment also revises the budget caps to allow for additional spending on important programs carried out by civilian agencies, including $5.1 billion for infrastructure improvement. President Eisenhower understood the importance of a strong highway infrastructure to our national defense. In fact, I think, at least colloquially, his legislation was referred to at times as the ''national defense highway system.'' But it was the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 which led to our interstate transportation system.

Today, many elements of that transportation system, both roads and bridges, have fallen below acceptable standards. We need to take action now to prevent further decline in that vital system. The unrealistic and arbitrary budget caps will result in deep cuts to critical infrastructure programs. We need more resources to invest in our transportation and infrastructure systems—not less.

In response to these shortfalls, my amendment would provide $5.1 billion to help meet critical infrastructure needs for roads, bridges, rail, affordable housing, VA construction projects, water infrastructure, and funds to mitigate lead contamination.

Here are a few facts for the consideration of my colleagues. Barely one-third of our roads are in good condition, and one-quarter of our bridges need significant repair. In my State, we have the highest percentage of structurally deficient bridges. Without increased investment, that number could double in the next decade.

The Department of Transportation has identified an $86 billion state-of-good-repair backlog for bus and rail transit. That backlog continues to increase at a rate of $2.5 billion per year due to inadequate Federal funding. Amtrak's busy Northeast corridor has a $28 billion state-of-good-repair backlog and relies on bridges and tunnels that are over 100 years old.

The Federal Aviation Administration's maintenance backlog has grown to $5 billion, and the FAA has identified over $400 million in needs for immediate facilities repairs that we are not able to meet under our current allocation. If we do not invest in our transportation system, efficiency and safety will be compromised.

Meanwhile, we have also an affordable housing crisis. Nearly 8 million low-income Americans are paying more than 50 percent of their income on rent, living in substandard housing, or both. In fact, for every four families that are eligible to receive HUD assistance, only one can be served within this fiscal environment. Families cannot pay for higher education or get ahead if the majority of income goes to simply keeping a roof over their heads.

It is also important to continue to adequately fund the Drinking Water State Revolving Fund and the Clean Water State Revolving Fund and to work to mitigate lead contamination. State revolving fund resources are critical to modernize our water infrastructure, reducing pollution, and protecting public health.

As the tragic events in Flint, MI, illustrate, when water quality is compromised, it becomes a public health crisis. Water quality oversight isn't just about pipes and infrastructure. It is also about preserving an ecosystem and keeping our sources of drinking water free from harmful contaminants. Inadequately funding these basic necessities means that we cannot meet the needs of our communities.

We also understand, particularly as we look across the globe at our competitors—our military competitors—

that our technological edge is narrowing. One reason is that they are investing a great deal in their research infrastructure and we are not investing as we were in the past, again, partly as a result of these budget caps.

So, my amendment would authorize an additional $3.5 billion for science and technological investment. Federal research centers like NIH, the National Science Foundation, NASA, and ARPA-E, all provide hope for treatments and cures for life-threatening and debilitating diseases, generate new technology, and make scientific breakthroughs. They are also key in helping to strengthen our economy and maintain our competitive edge—the foundation of our national security.

Again, the technological edge that we enjoyed over our near-peer competitors in the past is narrowing. Every defense official will say that. We are not simply going to fix it by putting some more money into defense-directed DOD research. We have to put money throughout our entire research enterprise. One other area is increasing our basic education. This funding would support full implementation of several bipartisan legislative efforts, including the Every Student Succeeds Act, the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act, and efforts to improve college affordability.

We can never be fully secure if we are not fully providing for the development of the children of this country, because they will eventually rise to positions of leadership, not just in the military but in other critical areas that will make this Nation strong and continue our ability to provide the finest military force in the world.

We have tried to articulate throughout that our national security is much more than simply the funding we give to the Department of Defense. A well-trained and educated workforce, a productive workforce contributes to our economy, and that contributes to our defense. Innovation through scientific research is important to our national security.

The agencies that I cited, particularly the Department of Homeland Security, the Department of State, and all of these agencies have a critical role overseas. They will not be able to play that role if we simply increase funding for the Department of Defense and not for these other agencies. For some time now, the President and Secretaries Carter, Hagel, Panetta, and Gates have implored Congress to end the harmful efforts of the arbitrary spending caps and sequestration.

During last year's debate, I repeatedly and forcefully argued that using the OCO account as a way to skirt the budget caps set a dangerous precedent. That was the reason why I reluctantly had to vote against last year's bill. I was deeply concerned that if we used this OCO approach for 1 year, it would be easy to do it next year and every year after that, ensuring an enduring imbalance between security and domestic spending. Such an approach would be completely counter to the original rationale of the Budget Control Act, which imposed proportionally equal cuts to defense and nondefense discretionary spending to force a bipartisan compromise.

Ultimately, we must return to an era of budget deliberations in which all discretionary spending, both defense and nondefense, is judged by its merit and not by arbitrary limits. We need to begin working together now to remove the budget caps and the threat of sequestration, not just for the Department of Defense but for all Federal agencies that contribute to national and economic security. Providing relief from the caps to only the defense portion of the budget, while ignoring the very real consequences of continuing to underfund the nondefense portion of the budget, moves us farther away from that goal.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON). The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. AYOTTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

JOINT MEETING OF THE TWO HOUSES—ADDRESS BY THE PRIME MINISTER OF INDIA

RECESS SUBJECT TO THE CALL OF THE CHAIR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 10:30 a.m., took a recess subject to the call of the Chair, and the Senate, preceded by the Secretary of the Senate, Julie E. Adams; the Deputy Sergeant at Arms, James Morhard; and the Vice President of the United States, JOSEPH R. BIDEN, Jr., proceeded to the Hall of the House of Representatives to hear an address delivered by His Excellency Narendra Modi, Prime Minister of India.

(The address delivered by the Prime Minister of India to the joint meeting of the two Houses of Congress is printed in the Proceedings of the House of Representatives in today's RECORD.)

At 2:20 p.m., the Senate, having returned to its Chamber, reassembled and was called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mrs. ERNST).

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2017—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I thank the distinguished Presiding Officer. What is our parliamentary situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is considering S. 2943.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INDEPENDENCE OF OUR FEDERAL JUDICIARY

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I wanted to speak based on my experience over the years as a member of the Senate Judiciary Committee—as the ranking member, as the chairman—on something very public that has happened.

Many Senators in both parties have appropriately condemned the racist comments recently made by the Republican Party's presumptive Presidential nominee about Judge Curiel. Sadly, these baseless allegations he has made against a distinguished Federal judge come as no surprise. We have seen for months that personal insults are the calling card of the Republican standard bearer. But I would say, similar to what many in both parties have said, anyone seeking the highest office of this great Nation has to understand the fundamental role that judges play in our democracy. The rule of law protects all of us, but only when administered by an independent judiciary.

I am deeply troubled by this attack on a sitting Federal judge, but make no mistake—it is not the first, nor will it be the last Republican attack on the independence of our Federal judiciary. This may be the most extreme example, but it is just the latest in a series of Republican actions that seek to undermine and compromise a coequal branch of government.

For more than 7 years, Senate Republicans have tried to block judicial nominations through stalling and delaying. They have even distorted the records of the men and women nominated to serve on the Federal bench. This systematic—and it has been systematic—obstruction has hurt courts across the country. But it is not just the courts I am worried about; it is the American people who go to those courts seeking justice. Judicial vacancies have soared under Republican leadership, even though we have dozens of nominations that have bipartisan support, and they are languishing on the Senate floor.

Earlier this year, Senate Republicans took their obstruction one totally unprecedented step further. Within hours of the news of Justice Scalia's passing, the Republican leader declared his unilateral refusal to allow anyone to be confirmed to the Supreme Court until the following year, even though he said this in February. It was an extraordinarily partisan decision, and there is no precedent for it in the United States Senate under either Democratic or Republican leadership. Since confirmation hearings began a century ago, never, never has the Senate denied a Supreme Court nominee a hearing.

Recently, two law professors extensively analyzed the history of the Supreme Court. They concluded that

there is no historical precedent for this refusal to consider Chief Judge Garland's nomination. In fact, according to their report, there have been 103 prior times in history when an elected President has filled a Supreme Court vacancy prior to the election of the next President and has done so with the advice and consent of the Senate—103 times. The Republicans' unprecedented obstruction—and I quote here—''threatens to damage the appointments process in the future and risks significant harm to the Court.''

The Senate Republican leadership has chosen to put the functioning of our highest Court in jeopardy for more than a year. That is the partisan attack on our independent judicial system that more Americans need to understand. When the dust settles on this latest series of accusations by the Republican's standard bearer, I hope the American people remember what this says about his disrespect for the rule of law, what it says about his disrespect for our justice system, what it says about how he will treat those who may disagree with him, and what it says about those who fail to hold him accountable.

Our Founders understood that this great Nation needs an independent judiciary. They designed our courts to be insulated from the political whims of the moment. They designed our judiciary to serve as a check on the political branches, including on the power of the President. Can you imagine a future President who does not respect the role judges play? A President who thinks judges should be disqualified from doing their jobs simply based on their race or their gender?

For the good of the country, I call on my Republican friends to stop diminishing our independent Federal judiciary. It is too important to be treated like an election-year pawn. Our Federal courts, from the Supreme Court all the way down, deserve to be at full strength, and the Senate needs to treat fairly the dozens of nominees before us, all of whom have earned bipartisan support.

It is not fair to attack sitting judges for political gain when they cannot even respond to the attack. It is also not fair to make allegations against judges who, as nominees, cannot respond because Senate Republicans refuse to have a public hearing.

If the Republican leaders of this body want to distinguish themselves from the rhetoric of the campaign trail, they should change course here in the Senate. Actions speak louder than words. They should allow Chief Judge Garland a public hearing and a confirmation vote this month. They should allow an up-or-down vote on the 22 judicial nominees who have been reported favorably by the Senate Judiciary Committee and who just sit here, waiting for a vote.

The American people deserve leaders who respect and support our Federal courts and have the courage to take action.

Let me say from a personal point that I remember the day I stood before the Vermont Supreme Court as though it was yesterday. I took my oath as the newest lawyer in Vermont, and I was the youngest lawyer in the State of Vermont. I was very conscious of that, being both the youngest and the newest. But I remember the senior partner of our law firm, who was a well-known conservative Republican throughout the State, and as a young lawyer he told me: Do the best job you can. Always tell the truth. But you do not criticize the judges. You might not like their decisions. You can always appeal them. Maybe you will win; maybe you will lose. But protect the integrity of our courts. They are above politics. They should not be brought into it.

Frankly, the attacks against a judge born in Indiana, a man who has defended our Constitution, the people of this country, even when his life was threatened—to attack him, to make racist comments about him, to demean the courts, to demean our judiciary, our Federal system, the best in the world—it made my skin crawl. It was puerile; it was wrong. I hope that all of us in both parties will stand above that and protect the integrity of our Federal judiciary.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TILLIS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak about my amendment No. 4299.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, not a lot of Americans know this, but we are at war in the Middle East. We are part of the Saudi-led coalition that is in the middle of a very dangerous and catastrophic war inside Yemen. The Saudi-led campaign inside Yemen began on March 26, 2015. The Houthis, a group within Yemen, had captured the capital in September of 2014. The Saudi-led campaign, of which the United States is a member, had intended to push the Houthis out of the capital.

The war has been absolutely devastating from both a humanitarian perspective and a U.S. national security perspective. Senator PAUL and I have submitted an amendment that I will not call up right now—but I may do so later in the proceedings—which would place some very reasonable conditions on the U.S. participation in this coalition, and in particular on the U.S. transfer of munitions to Saudi Arabia in order to continue this campaign.

What is the status of this civil war inside Yemen today? Well, first of all, as I mentioned, it has been an absolute humanitarian disaster. The war has left 3,000 civilians dead, and the total number of deaths is 6,200. At this time 80 percent of Yemen's population is wholly dependent on international humanitarian relief because they don't have adequate food, water, or medical care.

The capital, Sanaa, has been without electricity or running water for over a year. The capital of this country has had no electricity or running water for over a year. Nearly the entire population of an entire country, Yemen, is now dependent on international humanitarian aid in order to subsist.

During this time, the U.N. has documented 101 attacks on Yemeni schools and hospitals, 48 of which were attributed to this coalition-led bombing campaign that the United States is a part of. Hundreds of health facilities have closed due to damage and lack of fuel for generators, supplies, and shortage of medical personnel.

There have been multiple reports of cluster bombs—U.S. made cluster bombs being used in or near civilian populations. The United States has enabled this campaign. It would not happen without U.S. participation. There would not be a Saudi-led bombing campaign in Yemen without the United States. Why? Well, first of all, it is billions of dollars in U.S. weapons and U.S. munitions that are being dropped inside Yemen, including those cluster bombs. It is our intelligence that is providing the basis, the foundation, for all the targeting that is being done. One can argue that targeting has been dramatically insufficient given the number of civilian casualties, but there would be little way for the Saudis to do targeting at all without U.S. intelligence. It is Air Forces Central Command that has flown 709 air-to-air refueling sorties, offloading 26 million pounds of fuel to coalition aircraft. It is American refueling missions that allow for the coalition planes to fly. So the United States is an indispensable part of this coalition; thus, the United States is at war inside Yemen today, and very few people are talking about it. But we should, because in addition to a U.S. and Saudi-led coalition resulting in the death of thousands of civilians inside Yemen, this war is in direct contravention with U.S. national security interests.

First, the damage done to U.S. credibility in the region and amongst Muslim populations should be obvious to all of us when it is our bombs that are killing civilians. If you talk to Yemeni Americans, they will tell you that in Yemen this is not a Saudi bombing campaign; this is a U.S.-Saudi bombing campaign, so every death inside Yemen is attributed to the United States. We need to accept that as a consequence of our participation in this campaign.

Secondly, this coalition has made a very purposeful decision to target the Houthis instead of targeting terrorist groups, such as AQAP, which have used this civil war to expand their base of

operations. The coalition has made a very purposeful decision to target the Houthis instead of targeting ISIS, which had virtually no footprint in Yemen before this bombing campaign and now is growing by the day.

Here is what the State Department's annual counterterrorism report states about the civil war inside Yemen:

AQAP benefitted during 2015 from the conflict in Yemen by significantly expanding its presence in the southern and eastern governorates. . . . The group was able to increase its recruiting and expand its safe haven in Yemen. It also insinuated itself among multiple factions on the ground, which has made it more difficult to counter.

I almost want to read that again because what our own counterterrorism report has told us is that the U.S. intervention in Yemen has resulted in the dramatic growth in the strength of AQAP, an element of Al Qaeda, a named enemy of the United States.

We don't have a resolution that commits the United States to war against the Houthis. We have never given the administration the power to fight the Houthis. We have given the administration the power to fight Al Qaeda. There is still a pending effective authorization of war against Al Qaeda. Inside Yemen, there are the Houthis and there is Al Qaeda. A Saudi-led campaign, with participation from the United States, is fighting the Houthis—not a named enemy of the United States—while largely ignoring AQAP, which has grown in scale and scope.

The State Department further affirms that both AQAP and ISIL have ''carried out hundreds of attacks'' in Yemen last year, including suicide bombings, car bombings, assassinations, et cetera, et cetera.

So why are we doing this? Why is the United States relatively quietly facilitating a Saudi-led bombing campaign in Yemen that is in contravention to our national security interests? Well, there are a lot of guesses as to why.

One is that as a consequence of the Iran nuclear agreement, we have to make a renewed commitment to the Saudis to push back on Iranian influence in and around the region. There is no doubt that there is a very direct connection between the Houthis and the Iranians. Houthis are not an Iranian proxy, but there is a link, and there are going to be times where I would support U.S. efforts to push back on Iranian influence in the region. But in this instance, there is an indirect connection between the Houthis and the Iranians and all sorts of damage done to U.S. credibility and national security interests by participating in this coalition in the way that we are today.

The second argument is that if the United States weren't involved, the targeting would be even worse. There wouldn't be 3,000 civilian deaths; there would be 20,000 civilian deaths if the United States were not helping. Well, that may be true, but that is not an invitation to be involved in a civil war, because U.S. intelligence and targeting could probably always mean that fewer civilians would be killed. The fact is that it is likely that Saudi Arabia wouldn't engage in this conflict or bombing campaign at all if it weren't for U.S. support.

I think it is time for this body to do some oversight on a conflict that has been raging for over a year with billions of U.S. dollars at stake, the consequence being the dramatic increase of the power of terrorist organizations that have plots against the United States. Remember, AQAP is the most lethal and most dangerous element of Al Qaeda when it comes to potential threats directly to the U.S. homeland. It is AQAP that sits at the pinnacle of Al Qaeda's potential ability to strike the United States. Yet this Congress has remained almost completely silent as a bombing campaign funded and orchestrated in part by the United States has allowed for AQAP to get stronger.

God forbid that AQAP is successful in attacking the United States and that they do it from a base in Yemen that was made possible by U.S. paid for and directed bombs dropped on that country.

I think the White House has recently recognized the danger of continuing along this same pace. There are reports that the White House recently placed a hold on a pending arms transfer of U.S.-origin cluster munitions to Saudi Arabia over concerns about their use in Yemen in areas inhabited by civilians. But we have to do our due diligence and our oversight as well. If we are really serious about upholding our article I responsibilities to oversee the foreign policy of this Nation, then we have to add some conditions as well.

The amendment that I have helped offer to the NDAA would place two pretty simple conditions on our support for the Saudi-led coalition. Importantly, my amendment doesn't prohibit the United States from continuing to fund this effort. If I had my druthers, I certainly would argue that we at least take a pause, but I understand that the consensus may not be here in this body to temporarily or permanently halt our support for this campaign.

All I am suggesting is that we place effectively two conditions on our financial support and logistical support for this campaign inside Yemen:

No. 1, that the Saudi-led coalition make a commitment that it is doing everything necessary to reduce civilian casualties and that they are conducting this campaign in concert with international humanitarian law. I can't figure out why anybody would oppose that. Let's just say that if we are going to fund this bombing campaign, those we are funding should make a commitment to try to kill fewer civilians instead of more civilians.

Second, those in the coalition should make a commitment to use U.S. support to fight terrorist groups—Al Qaeda and ISIS—instead of just fighting the Houthis. The United States isn't at war with the Houthis. We haven't declared war on that group. We have declared war on Al Qaeda, and Al Qaeda is growing in its lethality, influence, and territorial control inside Yemen.

Another condition, as contemplated by our amendment, is to simply have the President certify as a condition of continued support for the bombing campaign that the coalition is fighting terrorist groups alongside the Houthis.

I think if I had 100 different conversations with Members of the Senate, I can't imagine there would be a lot of objection because of course we want to fight terrorism. Of course that is our priority, not the Houthis. And of course we want to do everything possible to reduce civilian casualties.

I am grateful to Senator MCCAIN, Senator REED, and also Senator CARDIN and Senator CORKER, who have some jurisdiction here, too, that they are willing to take a look at this amendment. I am not offering it today because we are contemplating ways to structure the language to make it acceptable to the chair and to the ranking member.

I will end this with a plea for the Senate to get back in the game when it comes to the oversight of this administration's foreign policy, in particular in places like Yemen. We have been out to lunch when it comes to authorizations of military force for a long time. There is no authorization right now to fight ISIS, but we are doing it. There is a decade-old authorization to fight Al Qaeda that we should renew. If we are going to be involved in spending all of this money and all of this time putting our soldiers and airmen at risk in the Yemen campaign, then we should authorize that, too, and if we don't authorize it, then the administration shouldn't do it.

So this is not an authorization I am proposing; it is simply a couple of commonsense conditions. I hope we can find a pathway to get a vote on this amendment, and I hope this body has the courage in the future to step up and call a spade a spade and do our constitutional duty, perform our constitutional responsibility to provide oversight of the foreign policy by this administration.

Thank you very much, Mr. President, and I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 4549

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. President, it is no secret we are living in a dangerous time. We face a variety of threats to our security at home and abroad. We all agree we need to make investments

in a strong military to protect and defend our national security. We have also come together in agreement on the need to take on our national security challenges and our challenges here at home in a balanced way.

The bipartisan budget agreement that we passed into law last year was far from perfect, but it provided much needed certainty for our economy by preventing the ongoing threats of a government default or a government shutdown. It restored investment in both our national and our economic security, ensuring that every dollar of investment in defense was matched by a dollar of investment in a stronger economy and a stronger middle class.

A balanced approach has served us well. It was a necessary compromise grounded in fairness that should guide our bipartisan work going forward. I understand that the chairman would like to give the Defense Department $18 billion more than they currently have from the American taxpayer, but I also know the American people need stronger investments in the challenges they face each and every day just trying to get ahead.

If we are going to spend more on our military, then it is only fair that we also invest more in education, in job training, and workforce readiness to raise incomes and create a stronger economy for all. If we are going to spend more on the Pentagon, then it is only fair we also invest more in putting people to work and rebuilding our crumbling infrastructure and transportation and water infrastructure.

I also know we have unfinished business in the Congress to bolster our vulnerable cyber security and to boost TSA security and to better support our law enforcement needs. We also have a responsibility to act on the public health crisis posed by Zika. We simply must do more and approve the necessary funding to prevent, protect, and respond to this serious and dangerous threat.

We need to provide relief to the people in Flint, MI, who are still suffering from the impacts of lead contamination.

I understand the military has asked for more helicopters and more fighter jets, but I also know that the American people need Washington to be stronger partners in the fights we are confronting in communities across our country today. That is why I am pleased to support Senator REED's amendment to invest $18 billion to help our middle class, to keep our country safe, and to respond to the Zika virus, lead contamination, heroin, opioids, and the crisis that we are facing with drug abuse throughout our Nation.

As I have traveled in Wisconsin, it is clear that we face a heroin and opioid epidemic. I know that many of my colleagues in the Senate face that same crisis in their home States.

In Wisconsin, it is a big problem, and it demands a bold response from Washington. We are in the midst of a crisis that is touching far too many across our State. I have heard stories from family members who have tragically lost loved ones to addiction, and I have heard from people who are on the path of recovery.

At one of my community meetings in Pewaukee, a father came up to me to courageously share a story of tragically losing his youngest son to addiction right after Christmas a couple of years ago.

Recently, I heard from Leonard, from Colfax, WI, whose grandson Nathan was killed in a car accident when he was just 16 years old. The driver of the other car was under the influence of heroin at the time.

I have also heard from a mother from South Milwaukee whose son suffered from addiction for 20 years. While he is now in recovery, at one point she found him on their bathroom floor, unconscious from a heroin overdose.

Another mother from Mukwonago wrote to tell me that her own son's life was saved by paramedics who administered the drug naloxone during his overdose, allowing him to survive.

The message is clear. Families simply cannot afford to wait any longer for help from Washington. It should not be easier for Wisconsinites to get their hands on opioids or heroin than it is for them to get treatment for their addiction.

Today, as we consider increasing our spending for our military, let's not forget American law enforcement, first responders, health care providers, and citizens fighting on the frontlines to combat our opioid and heroin crisis. Let's not forget those struggling to get sober and to stay healthy.

As communities continue to confront this epidemic on a daily basis, Washington needs to step up and needs to be a strong partner with State, local, and nonprofit efforts.

The first place we can start is by making emergency investments for prevention, crisis intervention, treatment, and recovery efforts. I was proud to support bipartisan legislation that provides this funding because these resources are vital as we continue to respond to this national emergency. Unfortunately, this funding was blocked by congressional Republicans. This epidemic knows no political party, and it should be an issue that unites us all.

We must do more because fighting this nationwide epidemic is a shared responsibility. Everyone has a role to play in addressing this crisis, and Congress should be no exception. The communities we represent need the resources necessary to win this fight.

From talking to the people I work for in Wisconsin, I know that the opioid and heroin epidemic is a problem that neither law enforcement nor the health care system can tackle alone. The Federal Government cannot solve this problem by itself, just as we cannot expect State and local communities to address it by themselves.

Together we must continue our fight and rise to this challenge. Let's work together to help our communities recover from this epidemic and stay healthy.

The Senate will soon vote on the Reed amendment. This amendment would provide $1.1 billion to respond to the opioid and heroin crisis. The amendment would invest a total of $18 billion, equal to the amount of funding that my Republican colleague, Chairman MCCAIN, is proposing to spend on the Department of Defense.

The vote is about fairness and priorities. I believe that, if we are going to provide more funding to the Pentagon, we should also invest in our middle class, ensure our security here at home, and step up to the plate and provide the resources Americans need to respond to the serious emergencies they face here at home.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Arizona.

AMENDMENT NO. 4229

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, on Monday I came to the floor to speak about the important provisions of the NDAA, sweeping reforms to the organization of the Department of Defense, to the Defense Acquisition System, and to the Military Health System. But I noted there was one challenge the Committee on Armed Services could not address in the NDAA: the dangerous mismatch between growing worldwide threats and arbitrary limits on defense spending in current law. This mismatch has very real consequences for the thousands of Americans who are serving in uniform and sacrificing on our behalf all around the Nation and the world.

From Afghanistan to Iraq and Syria, from the heart of Europe to the seas of Asia, our troops are doing everything we ask of them, but for too long we in Congress have failed to do everything we can for them.

Shamefully, our military is being forced to confront growing threats with shrinking resources. This year's defense budget is more than $150 billion less than fiscal year 2011, before the Budget Control Act imposed arbitrary caps on defense spending. Over the last 5 years as our military has struggled under the threat of sequestration, the world has only grown more complex and dangerous.

Since 2011, we have seen Russian forces invade Ukraine, the emergence of the so-called Islamic State and its global campaign of terrorism, increased attempts by Iran to destabilize U.S. allies and partners in the Middle East, growing assertive behavior by China and the militarization of the South China Sea, numerous cyber attacks on U.S. industry and government

agencies, and further testing by North Korea of nuclear technology and other advanced military capabilities. Indeed, the Director of National Intelligence, James Clapper, testified to the Armed Services Committee in February that over the course of his distinguished five-decade career, he could not recall ''a more diverse array of challenges and crises'' than our Nation confronts today.

The Bipartisan Budget Act of 2015—or BBA—provided our military servicemembers with much needed relief from the arbitrary caps on defense spending in the Budget Control Act. The BBA was a credit to the congressional leadership, and many of us supported it as a necessary compromise that provided our military with vital resources for fiscal year 2016 but was more constrained in the resources it could provide for fiscal year 2017. The fact remains that despite periodic relief from the budget caps that have imposed those cuts, including the BBA, each of our military services remains underfunded, undersized, and unready to meet current and future threats.

By the end of this fiscal year, the Marine Corps will be reduced to 182,000 marines, even though the Commandant of the Marine Corps, General Neller, testified last year that the optimal size for the force is 186,800. Facing a shortage of eight amphibious ships, the Marine Corps has been forced to examine options for deploying forces aboard foreign vessels, and a recent news report revealed the crisis in Marine Corps aviation. Years of budget cuts have left us with a Marine Corps that is too small and has too few aircraft. The aircraft it does have are too old and can barely fly—and only by cannibalizing parts from other aircraft. Pilots cannot train and receive fewer flight hours a month than their Chinese and Russian counterparts. Young marines are working around the clock to keep planes in the air with shrinking resources, knowing that if they fail, their comrades flying and riding in those aircraft could pay a fatal price.

Another news report showed what it means to have the oldest, smallest, and least ready Air Force in history, as our Nation now does. The service is short 700 pilots and 4,000 maintainers for its fleet, which is smaller than its mission requirement and lacks the spare parts it needs to keep flying. It is so bad that airmen are stealing parts from retired aircraft in ''the boneyard'' in my home State of Arizona and even museum pieces just to get their planes back into combat. Our aircraft are aging, but even worse, our airmen are left ''burnt out'' and exhausted. This is the predictable consequence of years of relentless operational tempo combined with misguided reductions in defense spending. Today, less than 50 percent of the Air Force's combat squadrons are ready for full-spectrum operations. The Air Force does not anticipate a return to full-spectrum readiness for another decade, and this will only grow worse as budget cuts force the Air Force to retire more aircraft than it procures.

The story is similar in the Army. The Army has been reduced by 100,000 soldiers since 2012, bringing the Army to a size that Army Chief of Staff Mark Milley testified has put the Army at ''high military risk.'' As the size of the Army has shrunk, readiness has suffered. Just one-third of Army brigade combat teams are ready to deploy and operate decisively. Indeed, just two—just two—of the Army's 60 brigade combat teams are at the highest level of combat readiness. To buy readiness today, the Army is being forced to mortgage its future readiness and capability by reducing end strength and delaying vital modernization programs, and the result of budget cuts, force reductions, and declining readiness is clear. In an unforeseen contingency, General Milley testified in March that the Army ''risks not having ready forces available to provide flexible options to our national leadership . . . and most importantly, [risks] incurring significantly increased U.S. casualties.'' I repeat, ''significantly increased U.S. casualties.'' U.S. casualties are the men and women who are serving.

By any measure, the fleet of 272 ships in the Navy today is too small to address critical security challenges. Even with recent shipbuilding increases, the Navy will not achieve its current requirement of 308 ships until 2021, and there is no plan to meet the bipartisan National Defense Panel's unanimous recommendation for a fleet of between 323 and 346 ships. A shrinking fleet operating at a higher tempo has forced difficult tradeoffs. Extended deployments have taken a heavy toll on our sailors, ships, and aircraft, and the Navy is no longer able to provide constant carrier presence in the Middle East or the Western Pacific.

In short, as threats grow, and the operational demands on our military increase, defense spending in constant dollars is decreasing. The President's defense budget is $17 billion less than what the Department of Defense planned for last year. In order to make up for that shortfall, the military was forced to cut things it needs right now: Army fighting vehicles, Air Force fighters, Navy ships, Marine Corps helicopters, and critical training and maintenance across the services. As a result, the military services' unfunded requirements total nearly $23 billion for the coming fiscal year alone.

Then there is a massive and growing defense bill that we keep pretending does not exist. Over the next 5 years, the Department of Defense says it needs a minimum of $100 billion above the Budget Control Act caps on defense spending, add to that nearly $30 billion in base budget requirements that are currently hiding in the emergency account for contingency operations—or OCO. That is another $150 billion over 5 years.

Put simply, according to our own Department of Defense and our own military leaders, our Nation needs an additional quarter of a trillion dollars over the current Budget Control Act caps over the next 5 years just to execute the current defense strategy—a strategy that I think many of us would agree is not doing enough to address the many global threats we face. My colleagues, we are fooling ourselves and we are misleading the American people about the true cost of defending our Nation. This makes no sense, and it is time to put a stop to this madness. That is what my amendment would begin to do.

This amendment would increase defense spending by $18 billion. These additional resources would be used to restore military capabilities that were cut from the President's defense budget request; address unfunded requirements identified by military commanders, especially those aimed at restoring readiness in the military services; and support national security priorities consistently identified by military leaders and defense experts in testimony and briefings before the Senate Armed Services Committee.

This amendment would increase the pay raise for our troops to 2.1 percent. The President's budget request sets pay raises at 1.6 percent, which would make this the fourth year in a row that pay raises for our troops were below inflation. Our troops deserve better, and if this amendment passes, a 2.1-percent pay raise would match the employment cost index and keep pace with private sector wage growth.

This amendment prioritizes restoring military readiness. Over the past 5 years, the combination of expanding threats, high operational tempo, budget cuts, shrinking forces, and aging equipment have created a growing readiness crisis in our military. Indeed, of the $23 billion in unfunded requirements identified by the military services, almost $7 billion were directly related to readiness. The NDAA took a first step in addressing these requirements by redirecting about $2 billion in targeted savings toward improving readiness. My amendment would add an additional $2.2 billion to help alleviate the readiness crisis and mitigate the growing risk posed to the lives of our servicemembers.

This amendment would stop misguided cuts to the size of our military that are based on outdated assumptions about the world. For example, cuts to the size of the Army were set in motion before the Russian invasion of Ukraine and the rise of ISIL. There is simply no strategic logic for continuing these cuts now and placing a dangerous burden on the backs of our soldiers. That is why my amendment cancels the planned reduction of 15,000 Active Army soldiers. It also restores end strength in the Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force, as well as the National Guard and Reserve. The amendment also prevents cutting a 10th carrier air wing.

Our military confronts an ongoing strike fighter shortfall, which is especially severe in the Navy, and a readiness crisis across aviation in the services. This amendment would begin reversing this dangerous trend by increasing aircraft procurement, including 14 F/A–18 Super Hornets and 11 F–35 Joint Strike Fighters.

The amendment also accelerates Navy shipbuilding to mitigate a looming funding crunch in the next decade. My amendment provides the balance of funding necessary to fully fund an additional Arleigh Burke-class destroyer. It also replaces funds for a third Littoral combat ship in the next fiscal year.

This amendment supports the recommendations of the National Commission on the Future of the Army. In order to support combat aviation across the total Army, including the Guard and Reserve, the amendment includes funding for 36 additional UH–60 Black Hawks and 17 LUH–72 Lakotas, 5 CH–47 Chinooks, and 5 AH–64 Apache helicopters. The amendment also includes advanced procurement funding for 10 more Apaches.

Despite the fact that our troops are still in harm's way in Afghanistan, where the Taliban is making steady gains and ISIL is now present on the battlefield, the President's budget request funds less than two-thirds of the current level of U.S. forces in Afghanistan. Both Republicans and Democrats on the Armed Services Committee have recognized that U.S. troop levels in Afghanistan should be based on conditions on the ground. That is why this amendment provides full funding for the current level of 9,800 troops in Afghanistan to help our Afghan partners preserve the gains of the last 15 years and take the fight to terrorists who seek to destabilize the region and attack American interests.

This amendment supports the European Reassurance Initiative by modernizing 14 M1 Abrams tanks and 14 M2 Bradley fighting vehicles for deployment to Eastern Europe to deter Russian aggression.

The amendment also provides vital support for our allies and partners. My amendment provides $150 million in security assistance for the Ukrainian people to defend themselves against Vladimir Putin's aggression. It also provides an additional $320 million for Israeli missile defense programs, including cooperative programs with U.S. industry in order to protect one of our closest allies from a growing missile threat.

In short, my amendment gives our troops the resources, training, and equipment they need and deserve to rise to the challenge of a more dangerous world.

I would also add one important fact about this amendment. Whatever some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle may say, this amendment is completely compliant with last year's budget agreement, the Bipartisan Budget Act. That legislation set binding spending caps on defense and nondefense discretionary spending, but the BBA set what the Congressional Research Service called nonbinding target levels of funding for overseas contingency operations, or OCO. In other words, the BBA gave Congress the flexibility to increase OCO spending to meet current and future threats if it saw fit. There is no doubt that this additional spending is needed, and this amendment provides it in full compliance with last year's budget agreement.

That said, I understand that some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle believe we also need increases in nondefense spending. That is why the Senator from Rhode Island has offered a second-degree amendment that would add $18 billion in nondefense spending. This amendment has some laudable programs.

I have long said that national security is not just the Department of Defense. I agree that we should provide additional funding for the Department of Homeland Security, the FBI, and the Coast Guard. I would have added the CIA and some of our other intelligence agencies. But I do not believe there is any national security justification for adding billions in taxpayer dollars to a defense bill to pay for infrastructure, national parks, affordable housing programs, or agricultural research.

While the Senate may not reach full agreement on the amendment by the Senator from Rhode Island, what I believe his amendment does show is that we all agree our military needs the additional resources my amendment provides.

I do not know whether the amendment by the Senator from Rhode Island will succeed or fail, but if it does fail, my Democratic colleagues will be left to answer a simple question: Will you vote to give our military servicemembers the resources, training, and equipment they need and deserve? This vote will be that simple.

Let's be clear what voting no would mean.

Voting no would be a vote in favor of another year where the pay for our troops does not keep pace with inflation or private sector averages.

Voting no would be a vote in favor of cutting more soldiers and marines at a time when the operational requirements for our Nation's land forces—from the Middle East and Africa to Europe and Asia—are growing.

Voting no would be a vote in favor of continuing to shrink the number of aircraft that are available to the Air Force, Navy, and Marine Corps at a time when they are already too small to perform their current missions and are being forced to cannibalize their own fleets to keep our Nation's pilots flying at far higher risk.

Voting no would be a vote in favor of letting arbitrary budget caps set the timelines for our mission in Afghanistan instead of giving our troops and our Afghan partners a fighting chance at victory.

In short, voting no is a vote in favor of continuing to ask our men and women in uniform to perform more and more tasks with inadequate readiness, inadequate equipment, an inadequate number of people, and unacceptable levels of risk to their missions and themselves. This is unfair, and it is wrong. It is wrong.

For the sake of the men and women in our military who, as we speak, are putting their lives on the line to defend this Nation, I hope my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will make the right choice.

For 5 years we have let politics, not strategy, determine what resources we give our military servicemembers. If we keep doing this, our military commanders have warned us that we risk sending young Americans into a conflict for which they are not prepared. I know the vast majority of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle recognize that the mistakes of the past 5 years have created this danger. Yet this is the reality our soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines are facing. It is our urgent and solemn task to confront it.

I say to my colleagues, Republican and Democrat alike, it doesn't have to be this way. We don't have to tolerate this anymore. Let's stop allowing politics to divide us when we should be united in support of our military servicemembers. Let's begin charting a better course today, one that is worthy of the service and sacrifice of those who volunteer to put themselves in harm's way on our behalf. Let's adopt this amendment to give our servicemembers the support they need and deserve, and in so doing, let's do our duty.

Mr. President, I know there are speakers on this amendment. I hope they will come to the floor to discuss these amendments so that we can set a time—hopefully this afternoon, if not tomorrow—on this amendment and the second-degree amendment by the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT). The Senator from Maryland.

AMENDMENT NO. 4549

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I rise in support of the Reed-Mikulski amendment to respond to threats to our Nation by raising the caps for both defense and nondefense spending.

All agree that we must defend the security of the United States. So many argue that we need more money for DOD, even though DOD already consumes 50 percent of all discretionary spending.

Here is a quick tutorial on the Federal budget. Discretionary spending is $1 trillion. The other two big expenditures are interest on the debt and trust funds, particularly for earned benefits like Social Security and Medicare. But on discretionary spending—what we can decide to spend of that $1 trillion—about $500 billion goes to defense.

We all know we are under some pretty big threats. We have fought a 15-year war. Our men and women deserve the best training, the best technology, and support for themselves and their families. I don't argue that. But I want people who like to say I am a numbers guy—let them know what the numbers are.

I take the position that we need to make sure our national security is what it should be, but I argue that not all of national security is in the Department of Defense. There are clear and present dangers to the people of the United States that are met by other agencies.

When we passed the Bipartisan Budget Act last October, we agreed on parity. What we said was that there would be parity between defense and nondefense. What does that mean? That means defense gets about $500 billion and nondefense, which is all of the other programs for the United States of America, gets the other roughly $500 billion. That means everything from Pell grants and the National Institutes of Health to Homeland Security, the FBI—I could go on and on.

I am willing to support the need to defend America by allowing more spending on defense, but I take the position that America faces other threats as well, and we need to maintain the parity.

The amendment being offered by Senator JACK REED and me, as an original cosponsor, says yes to the $18 billion for defense needs and yes to $18 billion for nondefense needs so we can make the Nation safe and more secure.

The Reed-Mikulski amendment does two things: It amends the 2015 Bipartisan Budget Act to allow $18 billion of relief from sequestration for defense spending—the same amount in exactly the same way as described by my senior colleague from Arizona, the American war hero JOHN MCCAIN. But there is another $18 billion in the Reed-Mikulski amendment for nondefense spending because there are threats to the United States of America in addition to the ones the DOD confronts.

So what does the Reed-Mikulski amendment fund? It funds those agencies that we think provide national security in addition to the Department of Defense. We are talking about more money for the State Department so they can do their diplomacy, so they can provide their Embassy security, and so we can meet the humanitarian need, where we are winning the hearts and minds of people and also making sure we help other people around the world. It will also give more to Homeland Security so that they can defend our coast and defend our borders, and it gives more money to the Department of Justice so they can track terrorists or keep an eye on things to make sure we don't have terrorist attacks here.

There are also other threats to the United States of America, one of which is in the area of cyber security. That occurs in order to have the protection of dot-military and dot-gov to maintain our continuity of government, and dot-com, which is essentially the functioning of our whole country that is not government or military. My gosh, everybody has been hacked. OPM was hacked. Look at all that we lost. There are over 1 million hacks a week going on against government agencies by people who want to steal our trade secrets from the Patent Office and NASA and NIH and FDA. Why invent a cure for cancer when you can steal it?

Then, of course, there is this threat to Zika. Make no mistake—these aren't cute little bugs coming from the Southern Hemisphere; these are bugs that when they infect people, particularly pregnant women, the results are horrific birth defects. Zika is a threat to the public health of the United States of America.

There is the danger of heroin, and there is a danger in terms of other kinds of environmental dangers, such as what Flint, MI, is facing.

We are also running significant deficits in research infrastructure and human infrastructure. I am going to elaborate on that in a minute.

Why do we need the Reed-Mikulski amendment? Current spending caps are $20 billion below the fiscal 2010 level. Let's make no mistake—we appropriators aren't exactly these wild big spenders. Neither is the Budget Act. The Budget Act we are working under is at the level of 2010. This amendment authorizes funding to meet real problems.

Other Members will come to discuss that, but I want to make clear that if you want to keep our troops safe, the best way is to give peace a chance. It is not a song from another era. If we want to try to prevent war, to contain war, or to end war, we need diplomacy. That is what the State Department does around the world—quelling conflict, stopping proliferation, supporting treasured allies.

We need to protect our people who work abroad, both our military and those who work at our Embassies. We need Embassy security. We need foreign aid to respond to real human needs while avoiding creating new enemies or new problems abroad. We need the State Department, but we also need Homeland Security. We need to protect our borders. We need the U.S. Coast Guard out there protecting us against drug dealers, terrorists, and helping to provide port security. We need Customs and Border Protection to secure borders. There are those who want to build a wall. I want to make sure we have the men, women, and technology to secure the borders. We need law enforcement to fight terrorism abroad and also to fight the drug dealers, human traffickers, cartel people, and organized crime. That is why we need the FBI's help and help from the Drug Enforcement Agency and the U.S. Marshals Service.

This would authorize $1.4 billion for the Department of Homeland Security and the Department of Justice to make sure we have enough people and the right technology to protect us, in addition to the spartan situation we find in the Appropriations Committee. We need to be able to do that. When we look at cyber security, this is all hands on deck, all government on deck, all of us on deck. We do need DOD to help with threats to our military.

We are increasingly relying on digital technology. I am so proud of what we do at the National Security Agency, the mother ship of talent focused on protecting the Nation. I am proud of the cyber command, but I am also proud of what we do through our cyber security in terms of what we do with the Department of Homeland Security, the National Institute of Standards and Technology, and others, coming up with new information for security technology. There are a lot of numbers and data, but I will skip over that.

Then there is the legacy of war. The legacy of war is what we owe our veterans. We just celebrated Memorial Day, honoring those who made the ultimate sacrifice, but we also extended our support for veterans everywhere.

Did the Presiding Officer know that 60 percent of Veterans Health Administration facilities are over 50 years old? The facilities are aging in place. The VA itself has cataloged $10 billion worth of maintenance deficiencies and code violations at hospitals and clinics. We are not talking about new construction. We are talking about deficiencies in maintenance and actual code violations.

The VA tells us about leaking roofs, mold growing, and other serious problems. I could go on. We all remember Walter Reed and how the years of neglected maintenance led to horrible conditions for our injured veterans and their families. They deserve better. They deserve facilities that are as fit for duty as they are.

Then there is this other issue that I am very concerned about, which is in the area of research and development. Some of my colleagues might say: What the heck does that have to do with being in the military? We need research and development to be able to come up with the new ideas and new technologies to protect our Nation. Look at what the Department of Energy did. They are helping to develop big trucks that sip gas like a Honda Civic. What does that mean? It not only means our military can be more efficient, but we can also be more energy independent.

The National Science Foundation has done so much in the way of basic research that it has enabled us to come up with whole new fields like nanotechnology or miniaturization that enables our people not only to have the smart weapons of war but the smart weapons against disease. My gosh, look at what we are developing just in terms of new technology.

I don't know if the Presiding Officer is aware, but a lot of the work that was

done at NASA, particularly in the area of space telescopes and rockets, helped us come up with the new digital mammography. Can you believe that? Because we studied space out there, we learned to protect our people right here, and it also helps others.

I also want to talk about the fact that we do help some domestic programs here in the area of children and human infrastructure. People say: What does that have to do with defense? I will tell you what General Dempsey told me. General Dempsey told me this, and he told others. So it wasn't like a little thing with General Dempsey. GEN Martin Dempsey, former head of the Joint Chiefs and decorated war hero said: Senator MIKULSKI, did you know that for every four people who want to enlist in our military, only one is found fit to serve? Either people are physically unfit, can't read, or have had a problem with mental illness or addiction.

We need to invest in our children. If for nothing else, we need to make sure all Americans are fit for duty, and that is why we need to do this.

We have spoken eloquently as to why we need more money for Zika, the need to fight the addiction some have with opioid drugs, and the situation in Flint.

Mr. President, as I said, I rise in support of the Reed-Mikulski amendment to respond to threats to our Nation by raising the caps for both defense and nondefense spending. All agree that we must defend the security of the United States. So many argue we need more money for the Department of Defense, DOD, even though DOD consumes 50 percent of discretionary spending. But I argue not all of national security is in Department of Defense. There are clear and present dangers to Americans met by other agencies, such as the Departments of Homeland Security, DHS, State, and Veterans Affairs, VA.

The Bipartisan Budget Act, which passed with 64 votes in the Senate last October, was based on parity—equal relief from the consequences of sequestration—because there have been significant consequences of sequester for the American people.

We are willing to support the need to defend America by allowing more spending on defense. But America faces threats at home as well, and we need parity in responding to those threats. That is why we are offering this amendment to say yes to $18 billion for defense needs and yes to $18 billion for nondefense needs, so we can make the Nation safer and more secure.

The Reed-Mikulski amendment does two things. It amends 2015 Bipartisan Budget Agreement to allow both: $18 billion of relief from sequestration for defense spending, the same amount authorized by the McCain Amendment, and $18 billion of relief from sequestration for nondefense spending, because there are threats that DOD can't address.

What does the amendment fund? There are five categories: 1, national security spending, in addition to DOD, for DHS to defend our coasts and borders, Department of Justice to track down drug cartels and terrorists and State Department diplomacy, foreign aid, and embassy security; 2, funding to address urgent threats to America, including heroin, failing water infrastructure as exposed in Flint, the Zika virus, and cyber security; 3, physical infrastructure, including funding for roads, bridges, transit, and VA hospitals; 4, research infrastructure investments, creating jobs through new products and cures; and 5, human infrastructure, providing more resources to underfunded, but overwhelmingly passed, authorizations for education and college affordability, workforce training, and food safety. This amendment meets threats to America with new funding not available in our appropriations bills due to austerity imposed by budget caps.

Current spending caps are $20 billion below the fiscal year 2010 level, 7 years ago. These cuts have consequences. This amendment authorizes funding to meet real problems. Other members of the Appropriations Committee will come to the floor to discuss needs in their subcommittees, but first I want to talk about some of the dangers we are addressing with this amendment.

The best way to keep our troops safe is peace. But we live in turbulent times, which means we need diplomacy. The State Department works around the world to quell conflict and help displaced and threatened refugees, stop weapons proliferation, and support treasured allies, especially those absorbing refugees from Syria.

We need embassy security so we can bring our diplomats home safely. We need foreign aid to respond to real human needs while avoiding creating new enemies abroad. We need the State Department to help keep America safe. That is why the Reed-Mikulski amendment includes $1.9 billion to continue the key security mission of the State Department.

Communities in the U.S. face lone-wolf terrorists, drug traffickers, and smugglers. The Department of Defense doesn't fight domestic crime and terrorism. We need the Department of Homeland Security's Coast Guard protecting our coasts; Transportation Security Administration, TSA, keeping air travel safe; and Customs and Border Protection, CBP, securing the border. We also need the Department of Justice's Federal Bureau of Investigation, FBI, Drug Enforcement Administration, and U.S. Marshals.

This amendment authorizes $1.4 billion for DHS and the Department of Justice, so they can improve outrageous wait times at airports, meeting growing passenger volume, which is up 7.4 percent from 2015, without compromising safety; hire 2,000 officers on the borders; hire FBI, local police, and other Federal law enforcement to capture and prosecute criminals here in America—violent crime rose nearly 2 percent last year after falling in 2 prior years. The Department of Defense can't do those things.

I now want to turn to a threat that requires all hands on deck: cyber security. We need DOD to help threats to our military, which is increasingly reliant on digital technology, and threats from nation states. I am so proud of Cyber Command, Fort Meade, and the National Security Agency, NSA, the mothership of talent, focused on protecting the Nation.

But we have not done enough to protect ourselves at home. More than 22 million Americans are at risk of identity theft because our own Office of Personnel Management couldn't keep their records safe. We need the FBI finding the criminals behind the keyboards, DHS advising Federal agencies, and the National Institute of Standards and Technology setting standards. And every agency needs to secure itself.

Last year, Federal agencies reported 77,000 cyber incidents—up 10 percent from fiscal year 2014. The Food and Drug Administration and the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office need to protect trade secrets, and the Social Security Administration needs to protect our personal information. That is why our amendment includes $2 billion for cyber security, so our nondefense agencies can join DOD in the fight.

The Reed-Mikulski amendment helps America be more secure, but also safer. Americans are threatened daily with our roads and bridges failing, our waterways and ports needing modernization, and our transit systems clogged and crumbling.

Demand for flexible transportation investments is overwhelming. Since 2010, the Federal Aviation Administration's backlog has grown by $1 billion to a total of $5 billion, risking breakdowns in air traffic control. Amtrak carries 30 million passengers each year, but can't stop deadly derailments. Here in the National Capital Region, while ''safe track'' repairs clog highways and side streets, the Department of Transportation tells us there is an $86 billion maintenance backlog for bus and rail systems nationwide.

It is not just our transportation infrastructure that fails us; 60 percent of Veterans Health Administration facilities are over 50 years old and facilities are beginning to show their age. VA has catalogued almost $10 billion worth of maintenance deficiencies and code violations at existing hospitals and clinics. VA even classifies these deficiencies as Ds and Fs, from leaking roofs to air handling systems in need of replacement.

These deficiencies can cause serious problems. For example, old air handling units risk microbial contamination. If uncorrected, it could directly impact patient care because old ventilation systems would pump contaminated air into inpatient and outpatient areas. We all remember Walter Reed, where years of neglected maintenance

led to horrible conditions for injured veterans and their families. Our veterans deserve better. That is why the Reed-Mikulski amendment includes $3.2 billion to meet the physical infrastructure needs of the U.S.

It is not just our physical infrastructure. America's research infrastructure has failed to keep pace with inflation. The National Institutes of Health, NIH, has lost more than 20 percent of its purchasing power since 2003. The history of economic growth shows we need civilian research to create new ideas and new jobs.

The National Aeronautics and Space Administration built a methane detector for its Mars rover that is helping find dangerous gas leaks on Earth. The National Science Foundation funded two Stanford graduate students' effort to build a search engine that formed the basis for Google. The Department of Energy is helping big trucks sip gas like a Civic. Our NIH researchers are on the cusp of finding cures for Alzheimer's, diabetes, and cancer. That is why the Reed-Mikulski amendment includes $3.5 billion for research and development to create jobs and find cures.

We can't cure cancer without investing in NIH. Now, we are looking at a new health crisis and a new threat to America: Zika. Americans—particularly women and children—are in danger. The President has said $1.9 billion is needed to fight Zika and stopping it from doing any more harm. That funding is included in our amendment.

As of June 6, there were more than 1,732 confirmed Zika cases, including 341 pregnant women, in the U.S. and its territories. The mosquitos that carry Zika are already in at least three of our States, and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention estimates that soon they will be in 30 States.

There is still a lot we don't know, but what we do know for sure is that Zika has terrible consequences for women and babies. Scientists have confirmed the link between the Zika infection in pregnancy and serious birth defects in babies. The details about what Zika does to the brains of unborn children are truly horrific. Zika is a threat we can stop if we have the will and the funding to do so.

Another emergency we can stop is the heroin epidemic. Every Senator and Governor has heard about the resurgence of heroin, which knows no boundaries—geographic or socioeconomic. Since 1999, the rate of heroin and opioid deaths quadrupled to an average of 78 deaths each day.

The Senate passed the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act, CARA, on March 10 with a vote of 94–1. Authorization is nice, but we need the money to fund law enforcement, treatment and recovery and better pain management so people don't get hooked on opioids in the first place. That is why the Reed-Mikulski amendment includes $1.1 billion for heroin response and treatment.

Every community is dealing with addiction, but every State also worries about its water. The amendment also includes $1.9 billion to upgrade water systems throughout the U.S. Today, nearly 100,000 residents of Flint don't have clean and safe drinking water. Up to 9,000 children may have lead poisoning; some are already exhibiting signs in school. Flint's water is still contaminated because its pipes are permanently damaged.

This is a national crisis. Flint is ground zero. Contaminated drinking water is happening in cities and rural communities across America. This is about the infrastructure and our failure to replace it. But it is about more than just replacing pipes. It is about the human infrastructure. This is about the lives of our children. What happened in Flint, MI is a failure of a State's government to protect its own people. The threat from our aging water systems is real, and it can't be solved by DOD.

From our water infrastructure to our human infrastructure which includes the very troops who make up the DOD, we must do more to ensure readiness. Shockingly, General Dempsey tells us only one of every four recruits qualifies for duty. One can't read, one can't meet physical requirements, and one is disqualified due to legal or mental problems. They wanted to serve, but did we serve them?

We have overwhelmingly passed authorizations to help. The Every Student Succeeds Act, which passed the Senate 85–12, aims to give kids a better K–12 education so they are ready for college, careers, or military service. But implementation is underfunded in the fiscal year 2017 Labor-HHS-Education bill by more than $1 billion. We can't say we want to solve problems with great policies, but then fail to fund the solutions. That's why the Reed-Mikulski amendment includes $900 million for underfunded authorizations of education and college affordability, job training, and food safety policy.

I talked at the beginning about how the State Department makes America safe with diplomacy and foreign aid. But I want to end with how foreign aid can help make us safer by helping the lost generation of children across the globe that is on the move and on the march.

Nearly 60 million people worldwide are forced from their homes due to conflict and persecution. Refugees account for 20 million of those people, half of which are children. This is not an isolated problem. Millions of refugees are from Syria and Iraq, Yemen, South Sudan, Burundi, and other conflict zones. What do they have in common? They are desperately in need of lifesaving assistance, including food, water, medical care, and shelter. Many will not be able to return home for years—if ever.

These refugees cannot survive indefinitely on relief aid. The children need to attend school. The adults need jobs. These refugees are scared and ready to face the unknown, rather than endure the brutality at home. They are only asking for one thing: help. All of us remember a time when, as a child, we needed help or our parents needed help. We also remember the names and faces of those who helped and those who refused.

What do we think they are doing? Do we want these children to remember the United States as the people who helped, or as the people who refused? If we don't help, what are we creating? A generation of people who hate and distrust us because of our refusal when they were in need. We need the Reed-Mikulski amendment so our frugality doesn't create a generation that hates America.

We all want to protect America. I support the troops. I support the Department of Defense. I support the men and women at Maryland's nine military bases. The Chairman of the Armed Services says they need $18 billion more to meet the threats around the world. I support that effort, but only if there is parity. That is why we are proposing $18 billion to meet threats to America not funded by the Department of Defense. I urge my colleagues to support the Reed-Mikulski amendment to raise the caps for both defense and nondefense items that defend America.

I note that the distinguished majority leader is on the floor.

If we are going to spend more money on defense, even though we already spend roughly $500 billion—about 50 percent of all discretionary spending—let's also spend money on other agencies that enable us to have a strong national security. Let's also put money into the other threats to the United States. Right now there is a public health crisis with Zika. There is a public health crisis with opioid and heroin addiction and a crisis in Flint, MI. Others are facing environmental problems. Let's make these other investments to make sure we keep America strong.

I yield the floor by saying: Let's please vote for the Reed-Mikulski second-degree amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUESTS—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, our government has work to do, but when it comes to making sure that our courts have the judges they need, when it comes to making sure that the Federal agencies have the leaders they need, and when it comes to filling a vacant seat on the highest Court in this Nation, Senate Republicans refuse to do their job.

Senate Republicans have a long history of obstructing President Obama's nominees. Earlier this week, I released a report documenting that long history. The Republicans have slowed down the confirmation of judicial nominees to a crawl—the people needed to resolve important legal disputes.

They have stalled confirmations of key agency heads. These are the people needed to protect consumers, to protect our environment, and to defend our country.

They are blocking Merrick Garland, a judge whom our colleague from Utah, Senator ORRIN HATCH, previously called a ''fine man'' whom the President could ''easily name'' to fill the vacancy on the Supreme Court.

Instead of working to make government function and more efficient, Senate Republicans have made it their priority to keep key positions empty for as long as possible—to hamstring efforts to protect consumers and workers, to delay efforts to hold large corporations accountable, and to slow down work to promote equality.

The view of Senate Republicans seems to be pretty simple. If government isn't working for them, their rich friends, or their rightwing allies, then Senate Republicans aren't going to let it work for anyone. But it isn't too late. They still have time to put aside their extremism and start doing what they were sent here to do.

Start with district court judges, the men and women who resolve disputes over how government works and whether the Constitution or Federal laws are being respected. They do an enormous amount of work. Their work is not political. Democratic and Republican Senators have worked with the President to select these nominees.

As of today the Senate Judiciary Committee has cleared 15 people who were nominated for seats on the Federal district courts. These nominees have the support of Democrats and Republicans. They are ready to serve their country. One of them is from Massachusetts. We need our judge. This Nation needs its judges. So let's vote.

Mr. President, I rise today to ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following 15 nominations: Calendar Nos. 357, 358, 359, 362, 363, 364, 459, 460, 461, 508, 569, 570, 571, 572, and 573; that the Senate proceed to vote without intervening action or debate on the nominations in the order listed; that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to the nominations; that any related statements be printed in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action, and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, we continue to process judicial nominations, and we have done so even when a majority of the Republican conference did not support the nominee, as was the case with the district court nominee from Maryland, whom we confirmed before the recess. That is an example of a judge confirmed that a majority of Republicans did not approve of.

Just this past Monday, the first day after the recess, we confirmed two more article III judicial nominees. We tried to confirm them before the recess, by the way, but our Democratic colleagues would not clear them.

President Obama has had many more judicial nominees confirmed than President Bush did at the same point in his Presidency. We will continue to process his judicial nominations, but the minority is not going to dictate to the majority when and how we will do so.

I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Ms. WARREN. I ask through the Chair if the majority leader will yield for a question.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I yielded the floor.

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, I am asking if the majority leader will yield for a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader does not have the floor.

Ms. WARREN. All right, I will just ask my question.

On Monday, I wanted to come to the Senate floor to make the request I just made, but I guess the majority leader was taking a lot of heat about judges and Donald Trump's racist statements about them and didn't want to draw any more attention to the Republicans' unprecedented blockade of judicial nominations. So the Republicans offered me a deal: Just go away, and we will confirm two Court of International Trade judges.

The Court of International Trade is pretty important. It handles trade enforcement cases, and nearly half of that court has been empty for a year because Republicans refused to do their jobs.

These two uncontroversial nominees have been twisting in the wind for 336 days. They are highly qualified, honorable lawyers who are ready to serve their country. So on Monday, I took the deal. The Republicans released two hostages, and the Senate confirmed them by a voice vote, without objection—not a single objection nearly a year after they were nominated.

Today, the majority leader isn't offering to release any hostages, and my question for the majority leader is, What happened between Monday and today?

I yield the floor if the majority leader wishes to respond.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, we tried to confirm the article III judges she is referring to before the recess and our Democratic colleagues would not clear them.

I don't know whether the Senator from Massachusetts has additional UCs to propound or not, but if she does, I would respectfully suggest she propound them.

Ms. WARREN. Then I certainly will.

Mr. President, last week the majority leader wrote an op-ed in the Wall Street Journal, and it was titled, without a hint of irony, ''How the Senate Is Supposed to Work.'' In his article, Senator MCCONNELL declared: ''On issues of great national significance, one party should simply never force its will on everybody else.'' He pleaded that ''it's not an act of betrayal to work with one's political adversaries when doing so is good for the country.''

Senator MCCONNELL agreed to confirm two highly qualified judges on Monday because it served his political interests. Today, he doesn't feel like it, so he forces his will on everyone else. That is not how the Senate is supposed to work.

The Constitution is clear. The Senate's job is to provide advice and consent on the President's judicial nominees. There is no asterisk that says ''only when the majority leader has an embarrassing political problem'' or ''except when the President is named Barrack Obama.''

It is not what the Founders had in mind because it is small, it is petty, and it is absurd. For these district court nominees, the U.S. Senate should be asking one question and one question only: Are these judges qualified or are they not qualified? That is it. But that is not what is happening in the U.S. Senate. Instead, good people twist in the wind, hung up as political hostages, and that is undermining the integrity of our courts.

So if you will not give all 15 judges their votes, let's at least have a vote on the 9 district court nominees who had their Judiciary Committee hearings last year. Senator TOOMEY called for some of these nominees to be confirmed last month. All of these nominees have been waiting for at least 6 months—almost 200 days—since their hearings. When President Reagan was in office, almost no uncontroversial nominees took longer than 100 days to confirm from the day they were nominated. The delay is ridiculous. Give them their votes.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nine nominations that have been pending since 2015: Calendar Nos. 357, 358, 359, 362, 363, 364, 459, 460, 461; that the Senate proceed to vote without intervening action or debate on the nominations in the order listed; that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to the nominations; that any related statements be printed in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action, and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, so our colleagues are not confused, looking at the Bush years to today and the Obama

years to today—apples and apples—President Obama has had 327 judges confirmed, and President Bush had 304. President Obama has not been treated unfairly. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Massachusetts.

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, right this minute, right here on the floor of the Senate, we face one of those ''issues of great national significance'' that the majority leader wrote about in the Wall Street Journal. It is an exploding number of judicial vacancies.

The Washington Post recently reported:

> Of 673 U.S. district court judgeships, 67—or 10 percent—are vacant under President Obama, nearly twice as many as at this point of Republican George W. Bush's presidency and 50 percent higher than at this time under Bill Clinton or George H.W. Bush.
>
> The number of federally designated district court ''judicial emergencies''—where seats carry particularly heavy caseloads or have been open for an extended period—is also roughly double what it was in May 2008 and May 2000.

Addressing those emergencies is good for the country. Keeping our courts functioning is good for the country. Confirming nominees who have the support of Republicans and Democrats is good for the country.

But just a minute ago, the majority leader blocked confirmation of all 15 noncontroversial judges who are waiting for votes. That is not putting the country first; that is putting politics first. It is forcing the will of a small number of extremist Republicans on the entire country, and the integrity of our judicial branch is suffering for it.

So let me try this again. Surely we can agree to confirm the four oldest nominations on this list—two Democratic recommendations and two Republican recommendations. They all had hearings in September, 9 months ago. What are we waiting for? Give them their votes.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following four nominations: Calendar Nos. 357, 358, 359, and 362; that the Senate proceed to vote without intervening action or debate on the nominations in the order listed; that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to the nominations; that any related statements be printed in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action, and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I object, unfortunately.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I rise once again to discuss the state of our Nation's healthcare system.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts still has the floor.

Mr. HATCH. Oh, she does?

Ms. WARREN. Yes.

Mr. President, I wish I could say that I am surprised by this, but I am not surprised.

The Republican leader can say whatever he wants today, but he has made his intentions very clear when it comes to President Obama. On the eve of the 2010 elections, Senator MCCONNELL said that ''the single most important thing we want to achieve is for President Obama to be a one-term president.''

Well, President Obama won reelection, but Senate Republicans have still stalled, delayed, and blocked his nominees. Since they took charge of the Senate last year, these Republicans are on pace for the lowest number of judicial confirmations in more than 60 years.

So can we at least confirm one noncontroversial district judge?

The nominee on the list who has been waiting the longest is Brian Martinotti. New Jersey needs this judge. He was nominated a year ago. He has been twisting in the wind for 9 months since his confirmation hearing. Give him a vote.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 357; that the Senate proceed to vote without intervening action or debate on the nomination; that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to the nomination; that any related statements be printed in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action, and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I reserve the right to object. I will certainly look at this and see what can be done, but at this present time, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, Brian Martinotti deserves better than this. All these nominees deserve better than this. Merrick Garland deserves better than this, and the American people deserve better than this. We will keep fighting to try to get the Senate Republicans to do their job.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I have only been here 40 years, and this happens every time at the end. They have not been mistreated. The fact is that they have had more judges confirmed in 7 years than President Bush had in a full 8 years, and they are going to have more judges. But it is the majority leader's determination as to when those judges will come up and when they will be confirmed, and I think he has been doing it on a regular basis.

I hate to go back in time, but I could go back in time and show how the delays on the Republican judges with the Republican Presidents were just unbelievable. All I can say is that it is nice to raise these fusses around here—and I don't blame the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts because she is doing her job—but let's allow the majority leader to do his job as well.

OBAMACARE AND THE ECONOMY

Mr. President, I rise once again to discuss the state of our Nation's health care system and what we can likely expect in 2017 under ObamaCare. This is a good subject following on to the judgeship discussion because the Democrats are acting so offended and so mistreated. Well, I hate to tell you how we were mistreated time after time after time when we had Republican Presidents.

Let me just talk about what we can expect in 2017 under ObamaCare. However, before I delve into that discussion, it is important to provide a little context.

Roughly 7½ years ago, President Obama was sworn into office, riding on a wave of good will, optimism, and so many promises about what he was and was not going to do that it was difficult to keep track. Seven and a half years may not be all that long in the grand scheme of things, but it is surely long enough to evaluate the economic successes and failures of a single administration. Let's take a look at what we have witnessed in the years President Obama has been in office.

Since January 2009, our Nation's gross domestic product has grown at an average annual rate of only 1.7 percent. Think of that—1.7 percent in 7½ years—and the overall trajectory hasn't been improving. In the last quarter, our economy grew at the slowest rate in 2 years.

At the same time we have experienced that slow GDP growth, wage growth has been sluggish and median household income in the United States has actually gone down under this President, declining at an annual rate of almost one-half of 1 percent. Slow economic growth, slow wage growth, declining household incomes—and this past Friday we learned that the economy added only 38,000 jobs in May, with job gains having averaged a sluggish 112,000 per month since President Obama took office.

When are the American people going to wake up and realize these people are not doing their job? Not only are they not doing their job, they are doing a lousy job.

There is not a new normal here either. They are trying to pass off that they have low unemployment rates. They are not counting all the people who just don't even look for a job anymore. If you count them, it is well over 9 percent. That is what we have seen in the Obama economy.

Sadly, even that doesn't tell the whole sad story. Along with a stagnant economy and declining household income, the cost of health care has gone

up almost exponentially—and exponentially in some areas. Health care premiums for families with employer-based coverage—one of a handful of benchmarks for measuring the costs of health care in the United States—have gone up by an average of 5 percent a year. That trend, according to both the Congressional Budget Office and the Joint Committee on Taxation, is expected to continue over the next decade, with premiums in the individual health insurance market going up at an even faster rate.

Meanwhile, the Federal Reserve projects that growth in our economy will range between 1.8 percent and 2.3 percent, well below historic averages and far below the growth rate for average health insurance premiums.

Do you think we are going to do any better with a new Democratic President? I don't think so. She has already admitted she is going to follow the principles of this President and the program of this President.

Long story short, under this President we have seen mostly lackluster economic growth and a decline in household income while the cost of health insurance has eaten up an increasingly larger share of American families' earnings and an ever-growing percentage of our national economy. According to most credible projections, it is only going to get worse. There are still 30 million people without health insurance, about the number there was when they came up with this colossal wasteful mess of the health care bill.

This correlation of economic stagnation and exploding health care costs is particularly damning for this President because his signature domestic achievement—his top priority after being elected—was passage of the so-called Affordable Care Act, a law that was, among many other things, supposed to bring down health care costs.

The word ''affordable'' is actually the operative word in the name of the law. Yet it is probably the least suitable word for describing what this statute has actually done to our health care system.

It has now been 3 years since the Affordable Care Act was fully implemented and in effect. And in all 3 of those years, average health insurance premiums in the United States have gone up by double-digits in many markets. Insurers are currently making rate decisions for year 4 of ObamaCare, and from what we have seen thus far, things are only going to get worse. According to one analyst, the average of the weighted rate increases requested from 28 States and the District of Columbia is approximately 20 percent.

Indeed, over the past few months, it seems as though we have seen a new headline every day that highlights the failure of ObamaCare to bring down premiums.

For example, we have recently learned that in New York patients may see an average premium increase of 17 percent on the ObamaCare insurance exchanges. In fact, one major New York carrier requested a rate hike of 45 percent over what they charged last year—or should I say this year, I guess.

In the State of New Mexico, one major insurer requested a premium increase of more than 83 percent, and those States are not outliers. Average premiums in Mississippi could increase by over $1,000 next year, according to recent reports. Insurers have requested average hikes of nearly 14 percent in the State of Washington. A major carrier in New Hampshire just requested an increase of more than 45 percent for 2017. Another insurer has submitted a request to raise premiums by more than 36 percent in Tennessee. People in other States, such as Virginia, Florida, Maine, Oregon, and Iowa, are all facing potential double-digit increases in premiums, with some in the 30-percent to 40-percent range.

Keep in mind these are just the States we know about thus far. More numbers and almost certainly more requested premium hikes will be made public very shortly. We are still waiting to see specifically what will happen for the people of my home State of Utah. Still, we already know that many Utahns are facing difficulties. I hear from my constituents all the time on these issues.

For example, a citizen from Roosevelt, UT, recently wrote to me to say this about her experience with ObamaCare:

> I can't afford the monthly premiums, and as long as I have to pay extraordinary deductibles, I may as well just continue paying for the visits as I go and not have to worry about the extra money I would have to spend in premiums, which are outrageous. . . . I realize I will have to pay a penalty when I do my taxes, but it will be way less than the premiums I would have had to pay had I signed up for this health care debacle.

Another constituent named Richelle from Santa Clara, UT, said this in a recent letter:

> As I am looking into purchasing the health care coverage we need; I'm finding that it is totally ridiculous. The catastrophic health care we were planning for a few years ago no longer exists because of the health care laws. In order to get LEGAL health care for me, my spouse, and my 3 eligible children, I'm being required to pay close to $1300 per month! These policies still require huge deductibles and will quickly eat up the money we've put away for such things.

Unfortunately, these stories are not isolated incidents. People throughout the country are growing more and more concerned about the cost of health care under the President's health care law. Even without the skyrocketing cost of health care, millions of American families would still be struggling to make it under the Obama economy. Yet for these people, all of whom have had to suffer through a period of stagnant economic growth and declining incomes, these rising health care costs are, at best, a slap in the face and, at worst, a nail in the financial coffin.

I have spent a lot of time on the Senate floor over the last 6 years describing what has gone wrong with the Affordable Care Act. I will not detail the substantive and structural problems with the law here today. Instead, I will just repeat what should be clear to everyone here. This law is not working. This law has imposed even greater burdens on virtually all the participants in our health care system, and this law is failing middle-class and lower income families throughout the country.

We can and we must do better, but in order to do so, we will have to turn our focus to the biggest problem that patients face as they navigate our health care system, and that is cost. We must bring down costs. Any future attempts at health care reform that are not cost-focused are, in my view—and I suspect the view of most Americans—a waste of time and effort.

As for me, my position is pretty clear. I support the repeal of ObamaCare, and I support a replacement that makes sense. I have worked with colleagues to come up with a replacement proposal designed specifically to contain costs for patients and consumers. A number of health care experts have concluded that our proposal, which we have called the Patient CARE Act, would do just that.

Of course, there are other proposals out there. For example, I know the House majority is working on a proposal, and I am anxious to see what they come up with. As chairman of the Finance Committee, which has jurisdiction over many major aspects of our health care system, I have begun reaching out to stakeholders to discuss in more detail the current premium prices and what needs to be done to address it.

But let's be clear. To bring down these rising health care costs, we will need significant buy-in from my friends on the other side of the aisle. Quite frankly, I don't know how any of them can read the recent news reports about premium hikes and hear the stories from their constituents about skyrocketing health care costs and think ObamaCare is working just the way it was supposed to.

As I have said before, my hope is that at some point my colleagues on the Democratic side will begin to acknowledge the failures of ObamaCare. At the very least, they should acknowledge it has failed to bring down costs for patients and consumers and is, in fact, driving up costs.

Until that acknowledgment comes, I plan to do all I can to make the case to the American people about the need for change and to work with anyone who is willing to put in the effort to address these monumental problems. I look forward to speaking more about these issues in the coming weeks and months.

With all the economic struggles the American people—particularly those in the middle class and with lower incomes—have had to deal with under the Obama administration, the last thing families in the United States

need is the continuation of the skyrocketing health premiums we have seen as a result of ObamaCare. I plan to do all I can to reverse this trend.

I know there are some on the Democratic side who knew from the beginning it wasn't going to work. Then they would be able to throw their hands in the air and say: It is not working. We need to go to socialized medicine or one-size-fits-all Federal Government control of health care in this country. Anybody who thinks that is going to be a good system, boy, have I got a bridge to sell you.

The fact is, as bad as our system was before, it was better than what this is. We can make it better, but it is going to take Democrats and Republicans coming together in the best interests—and get rid of the stupid politics involved—to come up with a program that will work for the American people.

I can tell you this, the American people cannot live on the slow growth that is currently going on. We cannot compete with the rest of the world on the slow growth that is currently going on, and it has been a slow growth for all of President Obama's time in the Presidency.

It wasn't all his fault, but—by gosh—there could have been programs that would have made it better had they just relied a little bit more on the free market system that has made this country the greatest country in the world.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TOOMEY). The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I come to the floor this afternoon to talk against an amendment that would undermine the spirit of bipartisanship we have cultivated with the last several budget deals without fully addressing our national security and domestic needs and to speak in support of an alternative that would do so much more to protect our families, improve our national security, and build on our bipartisan budget deal in a truly fair and responsible way.

As I will go into a bit more, for an amendment to a bill focused on ensuring our Nation is prepared to meet future challenges here at home and across the world, the Republican amendment ignores too many priorities in the nondefense world that are critical to our Nation's security. It only supplements defense priorities, leaving by the wayside domestic challenges, such as the Flint water crisis, the Zika outbreak, the opioid crisis, and domestic law enforcement agencies like the FBI, to say nothing of investments that we also know improve national security in the long run, such as education, health care, a strong economy, and more. It casts aside the principles we laid down in our bipartisan budget deal that we should be building on, not tearing down.

I want to spend a minute or two on that last point, since it is a very important one. As many of us have said before, a budget is far more than simply numbers on a page. A budget truly is a statement of values, of priorities, of the kind of nation we are, and the kind of nation we want to be. That is why I am so proud that following the tea party government shutdown back in 2013, Democrats and Republicans were finally able to come together, break through the gridlock, and reach a bipartisan budget deal.

Our deal wasn't perfect. It wasn't what any of us would have written on our own, but it was a critical step in the right direction. It restored investments in health care and education, in research, and defense jobs. It halted the constant lurching from one crisis to the next, and it showed the American people that we in Congress can make things work when we work together.

We were able to get a bipartisan deal because we kept to a core principle, which was rolling back the cuts evenly across defense and nondefense investments. That wasn't the only hurdle, but it was a big one. Both sides agreed that we may not agree on everything, but we had to solve the problem in a fair and balanced way and one that addressed all of our budget challenges here at home and throughout the world.

Establishing this principle and then sticking to it in our 2015 deal is what helped us make the progress we have made and build a foundation for continued work. I believe it is a principle we need to stick to if we want that good work to continue.

We reached a 2-year bipartisan budget agreement just last fall. If the Senate is about to open that bipartisan budget agreement on this bill, then we should be doing it in a thoughtful and productive manner that allows us to build on the 2-year deal and address a fuller range of security issues.

Unfortunately, the amendment we are going to vote on either later tonight or tomorrow would move us in the wrong direction when it comes to this productive bipartisan work. Instead of building on our deal, it tries to circumvent it. Instead of working together to truly restore investments, it uses a gimmick to pretend to restore investments, and instead of working with Democrats to restore cuts on the domestic side that support our national security as well, it only supports the defense side and leaves far too much behind. I don't think that is right, and I think we can actually do better.

If Republicans truly want to work with us to build on our budget deal in this bill in a way that truly prepares us to respond to domestic and foreign challenges facing our country, we have an alternative. Our amendment, the Democratic alternative, would restore investments that help workers, the middle class, veterans, and families all across our country at an equal level to the defense priorities. It would invest in critical priorities that clearly keep our country safe, including supporting the operations of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and supplying the Transportation Security Administration with the tools they need to keep our airports and other transit hubs safe that have become a target for terrorist attacks and allow us to tackle the opioid crisis that is devastating communities in my home State of Washington and across the country.

It would provide the resources for us to respond to the water and lead issues in Flint and many communities in our Nation, and provide resources to help us address so many of the challenges facing our workers, our families, our communities, and our middle class and do it in the fair and balanced way that we all know works by building on the bipartisan budget deal and treating defense and nondefense equitably and fairly.

I urge my colleagues to support the Democratic amendment so we can restore these investments in critical defense and nondefense programs and invest in priorities that keep us safe and strengthen our communities and the middle class. Having a powerful military is important to our country's safety but so is access to safe drinking water and so are TSA agents protecting our transit hubs, Zika research to prevent further spread of this disease, and so much more.

I hope we can work together to build on our bipartisan progress, stick to our bipartisan principles, and keep our country moving in the right direction.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I came to the floor to talk about the visit of Prime Minister Modi of India and to speak about an amendment I have, but listening to the Senator from Washington, I have to express my sense of wonder and amazement at our Democratic colleagues for whom no amount of money, no growth in the size of government is too much.

While I am certainly sympathetic to the amendment by the Senator from Arizona which would increase defense spending at a time when there is a greater array and a greater diversity of threats to our country than Director of National Intelligence James Clapper has said he has seen in his 50-year career, the idea that because we want to take care of the No. 1 priority of the Federal Government, which is national security and self-defense, we have to somehow use that to leverage more spending in other areas that are nondefense-related is simply unacceptable, particularly at a time when our national debt is $19 trillion.

The other day, I happened to be speaking to a young woman who said: Well, what would you tell me to tell my peers?

She must have been—who knows how old she was—in her early twenties.

She said: What would you tell me to tell my peers about politics and why

they should care and why they should be involved?

I told her: Well, if I were you, I would be angry. I would be mad. Your generation should be angry with my generation because what we have done is spent a bunch of money we did not have, and we have simply passed the debt and the bill off to your generation.

It is not just the $19 trillion in debt, it is also the pathway to Social Security and Medicare, the promises we made to our seniors for a secure late-in-life lifestyle that simply can't be kept unless we support and reform Social Security and make it sustainable for future generations.

So this is not the main reason I came to the floor to speak today, but I just have to express my own sense of wonder and amazement at our Democratic colleagues who want to continue to spend money we don't have because they know that if you end up spending this money they are asking for, it is just going to be added to the bill that is going to be paid for by the next generation, people like these young folks down here who are pages. That is, frankly, immoral, and it is not acceptable.

VISIT BY THE PRIME MINISTER OF INDIA

Mr. President, the main reason I came here to speak—today was really a historic day in Washington, DC, and in the relationship between the Government of the Republic of India and the United States of America. Like many of my colleagues, I had a chance to listen to Prime Minister Modi speak to a joint meeting of Congress this morning over in the House of Representatives. I was reminded of how far our two countries have come in such a relatively short period of time.

My first visit to India was about 10 years ago. I had been encouraged to go because of some of my constituents back in Dallas, TX, who started the Dallas Indo-American Chamber of Commerce. We actually have a large Indian-American community in the Dallas-Ft. Worth area and also in Houston. Around the State of Texas, we probably have some 250,000 to 300,000 Indian Americans—part of the diaspora Prime Minister Modi talked about before and of which he said he was particularly proud and which binds our two countries together.

When I came back from my trip to India, at the same request of the same constituent—he encouraged us to create a U.S. Senate India caucus, knowing that our two countries had a lot more work to do together. I am happy to say that 10 years ago, when Secretary Clinton was Senator Clinton, she and I cofounded the U.S.-India caucus. Later on, Chris Dodd—after Senator Clinton became Secretary Clinton—and then after Senator Chris Dodd left, Senator MARK WARNER is my current cochair. We have about 30-someodd members of this U.S.-India caucus, which demonstrates again the acknowledgment of how important this relationship has become.

I am grateful for the concrete manifestation—the evidence of that relationship, things like the fact that, as Prime Minister Modi said, India joins the United States in more joint military exercises than any other country.

We also have a robust civil nuclear agreement that allows for the exchange of critical information and technology. This has been a long time in coming. I think it was 2008 when the Bush administration advocated for this civil nuclear agreement which now, apparently, is coming to fruition. I noticed that President Obama and Prime Minister Modi announced the construction plans for a number of nuclear powerplants in India. India is a vast country—I think he mentioned 1 ¼ billion people. Many of them simply don't have electricity and live very impoverished lives. So it is an acknowledgment of our close-knit relationship but also of the need that India has, in order to advance and lift its own people to better living conditions, to have access to the electricity that is going to become available once these nuclear powerplants are constructed.

Of course, our economies continue to rely upon each other increasingly for trade and investment. As more and more American-made goods or American agricultural products are sold to India—with the rising middle class, there are going to be more and more people purchasing those goods and services. Of course, that is going to help improve jobs here in the United States, as well as the quality of life there.

Perhaps most importantly, we share growing cultural ties. Fast-forward to today. When Prime Minister Modi spoke today, he talked about his vision for his country's future, including deepening and broadening the relationship with the United States. That is a very welcome statement by the Prime Minister.

Unfortunately, over the last few years—7 or 8 years of the Obama administration, many of our friends and allies around the world have questioned our commitment to those friendships and these alliances, and, conversely, many of our adversaries have become emboldened when they see America retreating from its engagement with the rest of the world. We do not need American boots on the ground around the globe, but we do need American leadership around the world. There is no other country with benign intent like the United States that can fill that leadership void.

So I was glad to hear Prime Minister Modi talking about the importance of it. I hope we all respond appropriately. Of course, this is important not just today, but it will become increasingly important in the 21st century. The safety and stability of the Asia-Pacific region in particular will depend more and more on the safety and stability of India. Here in the Senate, we have had ample opportunity to work with our friends from India in order to guarantee that goal.

There are a couple of pieces of legislation I have cosponsored with Senator WARNER, my cochair of the U.S.-India caucus, that will bolster our ties with India.

The first would help bring India into an existing trade structure, the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation Forum, or APEC. It would direct the Department of State to develop a strategy to facilitate India's membership status in this organization, and it would urge APEC nations to support India's membership. As the world continues to become more interconnected through trade, we need to make sure like-minded countries with economic might, such as India, have a seat at the table.

Of course, it is a truism that countries that do business together and trade together are much less likely to engage in some conflict against each other. So trade is good for national security and internal security as well, not just for the economy.

The second bill I have introduced will help cement India's status as a major partner of the United States. It would strengthen our defense and technology ties and also make sure that India is equipped to handle the myriad threats coming its way. The truth is that India is at risk for many of the same sort of threats that the United States is. This morning, Prime Minister Modi mentioned the cyber threat. Certainly that is true, but we know India is a target for international terrorist attacks. Indeed, the Prime Minister mentioned the terrible attacks that occurred in Mumbai not that many years ago, when terrorists came in and killed a bunch of tourists there in Mumbai or Bombay.

I am proud to cosponsor an amendment to the Defense authorization bill filed by the junior Senator from Alaska. This amendment would encourage greater military cooperation with India. Even though it is at an alltime high, it could certainly be improved through more joint military operations and officer exchanges. This is really an incredible source of American diplomatic power and strength, particularly in our military-to-military relationship.

I can't tell you how many times I have been to countries around the world, the way I was, for example, in Cairo, Egypt, sitting there talking to the President of Egypt, President Sisi, who was talking about his military training here in the United States, in San Antonio, TX, my hometown. Of course I had to ask him how he likes the Tex-Mex, Mexican food. He said it was a little too spicy for him.

The point is that these military-to-military exchanges with countries like India and Egypt and others are a great opportunity for us to establish friendships and connections, and people who invariably—and I am sure nobody dreamed that then-Military Officer Sisi would become the President of Egypt, but he rose in that leadership position and now is the leader of that large

country of some 92 million people. So those military-to-military relationships, those joint military exercises with countries like India are very important.

Let me close on the Prime Minister's comments this morning by thanking him publicly. It speaks volumes to his commitment to further the U.S.-India relationship. I look forward to continuing to play a small part in that effort through the work of the Senate India caucus.

As Prime Minister Modi's visit illustrates, the United States cannot afford to ignore our friends and those who share common values, as Prime Minister Modi spoke. The world is simply too unstable and too dangerous. Plus, it is just plain stupid not to maintain a good relationship with your friends and allies and people who share similar values. But we also have to look at the other side of the coin, and that is to push back on our adversaries. And as I said, unfortunately, over his 8 years in the White House, the President has seemed somewhat detached from both of those—either encouraging stronger relationships with our friends and allies by demonstrating that we have their back and that we can be trusted or by pushing back on our adversaries when they take aggressive action. As I mentioned earlier this week, his first Secretary of State, Secretary Clinton, regularly lacked the ability to call a spade a speed, particularly with regard to challenges like our enemy in North Korea.

Not long ago—I guess it was in August of last year—I had a chance to visit with Admiral Harris, the four-star head of Pacific Command. When we asked him to list the danger spots in the world that keep him awake at night, he mentioned North Korea as the No. 1 threat. Of course, some of that may be the proximity of his command there in Hawaii. But the fact is, North Korea is ruled by a dangerous dictator who has nuclear weapons and intercontinental ballistic missiles, which is a dangerous mix.

Of course, unfortunately, under Secretary Clinton's watch and President Obama's watch, this has gotten nothing but worse. As we continue to consider the National Defense Authorization Act, we do have a chance to take up some of the slack, though. We are not without tools here in the Congress to fill in some of the gaps and to correct some of the misguided foreign policy prescriptions of the White House.

One way we can do that is by supporting an amendment I have filed that will help us hold Iran accountable for its recent hostile actions against U.S. sailors. We all remember that last January, two Navy riverine boats with 10 American sailors on board made headlines around the world when they strayed into Iranian waters. They were taken captive by members of Iran's Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps after being forced at gunpoint to surrender. The sailors were blindfolded. They were hauled back to Iranian soil. They were interrogated and detained. The IRGC henchmen documented the event at almost every step along the way, quickly broadcasting those videos and photos of the captured sailors among state-run media outlets.

This is not in line with international norms. This is not the way we would treat a foreign country's navy if the same thing happened, and the Geneva Convention makes clear that when military forces from one country detain military forces of another those prisoners are to be protected from public displays of humiliation, not to be used for propaganda purposes, which is what the American sailors were used for. Something called the doctrine of innocent passage—a concept of what is known as customary international law—provides that all vessels have the right of travel through another country's territorial waters to get from point A to point B swiftly.

It is pretty apparent that Iran violated our sailors' right to innocent passage, but we haven't heard a peep out of the White House. Instead, the administration has patted itself on the back and claimed their bad Iran deal somehow brought these sailors home safely. They claim that somehow the enhanced credibility they had from the misguided Iran nuclear deal somehow gave them a seat at the table and an ability to negotiate the release of our own sailors from Iran. This is absolutely ridiculous, and it ignores the crux of the problem. These sailors shouldn't have been taken captive in the first place.

While the President may leave this kind of aggression unanswered, we don't have to. My amendment would require the President to answer two simple questions: Did Iran's hostile actions in January violate international law? And were any Federal funds paid to the Iranian regime to effect the release of our sailors? In other words, did the Obama administration pay ransom to bring them home? I think the American people, certainly our taxpayers, have a right to know whether the Obama administration used their hard-earned tax dollars to pay ransom to a rogue regime like Iran's.

If the administration does find that Iran violated international law, sanctions on those Iranians responsible would be triggered under my amendment. It is absolutely imperative we not turn a blind eye to aggression by the world's thugs, tyrants, and renegades, which is, unfortunately, what we seem to do too often.

We need to hold Tehran accountable in some way. Since the President, so far, has refused to do that on his own, it is incumbent on Congress to lead on this issue, and my amendment is a good start. I am hopeful my colleagues will support it so Iran knows, even if it doesn't have to answer to the President of the United States, it will have to answer to the American people through their elected representatives in Congress.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GARDNER). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

WASTEFUL SPENDING

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, it is week 45 of ''Waste of the Week,'' where I have been here talking about waste, fraud, and abuse, and trying to find ways to save taxpayers' dollars. As I have said a number of times, our efforts since 2010 are to go big to address the real fiscal situation that this country is dealing with, the runaway entitlements, the ever-shrinking discretionary pot, and the deficit spending, leading to borrowing that has taken us from $10.7 trillion just in my first term here now in six years—from $10.7 trillion—to $19.2 trillion. I don't think any of us can contemplate what $19.2 trillion really means. But what it means in terms of its impact and effect is that we are passing on to future generations a debt that they will not be able to repay without serious consequences to our economy and serious consequences to their pocketbooks. That is a speech for another time.

''Waste of the Week'' is simply an attempt, since we have not been able to address the larger issue, to look at documented examples, exposed by inspector generals, the Government Accountability Office, and other agencies of clear waste, fraud, and abuse that has used taxpayers' dollars in an improper way. So this 45th edition now highlights close to $170 billion, exceeding our goal of $100 billion considerably and with no end in sight.

We are debating last week and this week the National Defense Authorization Act, critically important for our national security and to provide for the kinds of things our military needs to be an effective military. So I think it is appropriate to raise the issue that no agency is sacrosanct. While I am a committed supporter of national defense, while I served on the Senate Armed Services Committee for a 10-year period of time in my former time in the Senate and I support much of what the military does, it is important that we point out that they are not sacrosanct from falling into the category of abuse, waste, or money that should have been better accounted for and spent. So I am taking this opportunity during this debate to point out the fact that each agency of the Federal Government needs to be looked at, even those that we favor and want to support. Obviously, any penny, dime, nickel, dollar, or more saved from something that need not be spent is something that can help our soldiers be better trained and can help us have a stronger military. If not needed there, it can used to offset other programs

within the Federal Government, or, most importantly, hopefully sent back to the taxpayer or reduced from the taxes that we take from the taxpayer.

Today I want to talk about the acquisition process. The Department of Defense weapons acquisition system is the process by which DOD, or the Department of Defense, procures weapons systems or related items from various defense contractors. They include the design, development, deployment, and disposal of weapons used by our military.

Since 1990, the Government Accountability Office has included the Department of Defense's weapons acquisition system on its annual High Risk List. Let me explain that. The High Risk List, which is put out every two years by the Government Accountability Office, or GAO, lists spending that falls under the category of, frankly, ''Why are we spending this money in the first place?'' or ''Let's look at how we are spending this money and see if it can be spent in better and more efficient ways.'' It is looking at programs' vulnerabilities to waste, fraud, and abuse.

One of the biggest problems with the system is that frequently significant dollars are spent on weapons programs that end up never being completed. Between 2001 and 2011, the Department of Defense spent $46 billion on a dozen different weapons systems programs that were never completed. Let me repeat that: $46 billion of money was spent on programs, well intended, but never completed for various reasons. I want to use just one example of that $46 billion category, and that is a program that was initiated but was never finished and is an example of how taxpayers' money can be spent in significant amounts and with no results.

It was clear that after 9/11 we ought to be looking at the Presidents' transportation. In this case, Marine One is the helicopter the President uses when transferring to Andrews Air Force Base to climb aboard Air Force One or is used overseas for special short trips. Marine One was deemed to be somewhat behind on its technological capabilities, especially its communications and security capabilities. The Department of Defense initiated an effort to build a new helicopter; yet the requirements and engineering needed for this new helicopter design were never finally fixed. As the process went forward and the money was being spent, new ideas and new technologies came into play, and the thought was this: Well, let's add this here and change that there and incorporate this into it. As a result, the original engineering that had been mapped out, the requirements, the design were not followed. There were constant changes, constant pleas that we need to spend more money, we need to do more and more. On and on it went. Without those fixed and agreed-on guidelines, the Department of Defense continued putting more add-ons over the years until, ultimately, the helicopter became so weighted with so much new technology and security position adjustments and so forth that the helicopter's mission capability was compromised. As such, the program finally had to be scrapped in 2009, and the cost to the taxpayers was $3.7 billion—spent for no purpose whatsoever. It was a good idea, a good intent, probably the right thing to do, but without a sufficient acquisition system and development system, without an ability to say: Look, let's get this thing fixed in terms of what we want it to look like, what we want it to be, and let's go forward with it, and perhaps there are a few adjustments that we can make. But, certainly, it would be better to incorporate the new technologies at a rate that we thought we could accomplish within a limited amount of time, rather than simply ongoing—2001, 2002, 2003, all the way to 2009—and finally say we are never going to get there, ending up, as I have said, with $3.7 million of waste. That is just one example.

In the 2014 report, the Government Accountability Office found problems like this have persisted within weapons acquisitions for decades. GAO found that many defense programs are launched before officials have enough information needed to determine whether the proposed program is even viable. Meaning, there is a mismatch between the new defense system's wish list of all the things the DOD would like to have versus the current technology that would be able to provide within the current financial and time constraints for developing programs. In turn, the program sometimes gets the green light to move forward with unrealistic costs and timetables, leading to increased costs and development delays.

The Government Accountability Office and military experts have emphasized the need to increase DOD staff training on how to properly estimate project needs and technology capabilities before launching a project. Now, we would think this would have been simple. We would think this would be the guidelines from the very beginning: You don't start a project until you estimate what the project needs and the technological capabilities and the capabilities of providing those needs before you start. But there is a history within the Department of Defense—and, frankly, within policies of defense contractors—to get it started. Once it is started, they are not going to turn it back down. History is replete with Department of Defense acquisitions that have incorporated changes that, once started, you can't stop the thing. Then the narrative turns from this: Why are we doing this in the first place, because we never fixed the requirements and fixed the cost and agreed not to go beyond that cost? It turns into this: Oh, well, we need to spend more. We can't turn back now because otherwise we have wasted that money.

The Presidential helicopter is a perfect example. We are talking about $3.7 billion. On and on it goes. I have just given one example.

I am pleased that Senator MCCAIN and Senator REED, the chairman and ranking member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, have acknowledged this. This National Defense Authorization Act of fiscal year 2017 makes some very important reforms to the DOD acquisition process. They have taken note of this, and the committee has taken note of this. Before us now is this bill—the bill that sits on my desk and on every desk here and that we are debating and adding amendments to and hopefully will finish this week. In this legislation we are debating and talking about and hope to pass are a number of reform processes and reform legislation to help us address these problems. This legislation would reform the current regulatory process and make it easier for companies to compete for DOD contracts in order to boost competition and lower costs. In addition, the bill would increase training—maybe this is the most important of all—for those at the Department of Defense who plan and oversee the acquisition process. It will put greater emphasis on technological innovation, which could help save money while spearheading new, cutting-edge defense systems. That is the goal. That is the goal we have outlined in this legislation and why we need to support this legislation. It is an example of how the Senate can tackle waste, fraud, and abuse right now, and I encourage my colleagues to support these proposals.

Having said that, let me add, as we do each week, $3.7 billion for failed efforts to develop the new helicopter for the President, which brings our total taxpayer price tag to nearly $176 billion—not small change. Think what we could do with that if it was spent wisely or, more importantly, if we didn't have to take it from the taxpayer in the first place.

Mr. President, having said that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

PRESIDENTIAL TAX TRANSPARENCY ACT

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I rise this afternoon to discuss the Presidential Tax Transparency Act—legislation that I have authored with Senators WARREN, BENNET, KAINE, BALDWIN, and BOXER. The reason I proposed this legislation is that ever since Watergate, it has been routine for Democratic and Republican Presidential nominees to release their tax returns. In effect, this has been the norm; this has been the standard operating procedure for almost four decades. That is because the American people expect transparency when it comes to a Presidential candidate's actions and values.

They are running for the highest office in our land. They are running to be Commander in Chief for the most powerful Nation in the history of the world. When transparency is the overwhelming expectation of the American

people regarding the Presidency, my view is it ought to be the law.

We are in the midst of a Presidential election. The nominating conventions are weeks away. One of the candidates who has become his party's presumptive nominee has thus far refused to release his tax returns. In my view, this is a clean break from decades of traditions in our elections. It is a rebuke of the overwhelming majority of Americans, including a majority of Republicans, who are demanding openness and honesty from their Presidential candidates of both political parties on this issue.

The reason is that tax returns give the American people a lot of straightforward, honest answers. It is not just about what rate you pay; it is about whether you even pay taxes. Do you give to charity? Are you abusing loopholes at the expense of hard-working middle-class families? Do you keep your money offshore?

The fact is the tax return shines a light on your financial integrity. It will show if a person is trying to game the system, for example, by having their company pay for personal vacations on a private jet. Certainly, that is something far removed from the reaches of most hard-working families.

My view has been that running for President is pretty much like a job interview. Every candidate has to stand up before the public and show that they have the temperament, the background, and the character to lead our wonderful country and be Commander in Chief. I believe that after decades of tradition, releasing tax returns is a big part of the process.

When it comes to a candidate's financial background in taxes, I don't think the public should have to take somebody's word for it or just accept the kind of boasting you see on some of these shows that get wide viewership. The public has a right to know the facts, and the public has a right to know the truth.

The proposal that my colleagues and I have proposed is pretty simple. It says that within 15 days of becoming the nominee at the party conventions, the candidates would be required to release at least 3 years of tax returns. If a nominee stonewalls the law and refuses, then the Treasury Secretary would share the returns with the Federal Election Commission, and that Commission would make them public online. There would be an opportunity as well for redactions, which, in effect, are changes when appropriate.

When Presidents nominate individuals for Cabinet seats and executive branch jobs within the jurisdiction of the Finance Committee—the Treasury Secretary, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, Social Security—those nominees all submit 3 years of tax returns for the committee to review. When there is a need and where it is appropriate, information from those returns is made public. Remember, that is the standard for people who would serve under the President of the United States. In my view, the Commander in Chief ought to be required to do better. The fact is, nominees have traditionally released a lot more than 3 years. So probably it is a bit modest, and a number of people who have looked at the proposal support what our colleagues and I are doing, like the transparency, like the disclosure. A number of them have said: You really ought to think about going further.

I think colleagues know that I probably have spent as much time here in the Senate as any colleague trying to promote ideas and policies and get beyond some of the partisanship that dominates these debates. I am talking about candidates on both sides being required to meet this new bar. The same rules would apply to all nominees from both parties.

A word about this notion of requiring a Presidential nominee to do this: I certainly wish that it weren't necessary to have a law requiring this. That would be my first choice. The fact is, it shouldn't take a law because this has been the norm; this has been the expectation.

This is how I came to believe that a law was necessary. You volunteer to run for President of our wonderful country. You are not required to do it; you volunteer to do it. In my view, when you volunteer, there has been this norm, and there has been this expectation. Since Watergate, almost 40 years, there has been this expectation that you would make public your tax return. The failure to do so deviates from the norm, deviates away from transparency and in favor of secrecy. So my view is, when a candidate for President of the United States is not willing to disclose their taxes voluntarily and deviates from the norm, deviates from the understandable expectation the American people have, then I think you need a law, and that is why I have proposed it.

For these four decades, the American people have been pretty clear: If you are a major party's nominee to be the leader of the free world, you do not get to hide your tax returns.

This is the first time I have discussed our proposal here on the floor. I hope our colleagues will support the Presidential Tax Transparency Act, and I hope our colleagues on both sides of the aisle will agree that the American people deserve this guarantee of tax transparency that I have described this afternoon.

RECOGNIZING HERMISTON HIGH SCHOOL

Mr. President, I am going to speak briefly on one other matter that was particularly striking last week when I was home. I am going to talk for a few minutes about the wonderful work taking place at Hermiston High School in Eastern Oregon.

Last week, I had the honor of visiting the terrific Career and Technical Education Program—the CTE Program—in Hermiston, and I had a chance to watch some very impressive students in action. One of the programs I visited was the Columbia Basin Student Homebuilders Program that got off the ground with a small amount of State financial assistance. The reason I wanted to discuss it this afternoon is, I think this program that can be a model, not just for my State, but for the Nation. Students enrolled in the homebuilders program work with local construction professionals to actually build houses for their community. Under the supervision of a teacher, students learn all facets of planning, designing, and building a new energy-efficient home within a budget.

During my visit, Liz, a star high school senior and a future engineer, gave me a tour of this year's home. It is nothing short of gorgeous. At the end of the school year, this beautiful, custom-designed home is going to be sold to a lucky family. Students are involved in every bit of the process—from planning and design, to the actual construction, to the marketing and sale of the house. Revenue from the sale of the home funds the next project, so the next round of students in the program get to participate with no future funding required.

Hermiston High School's career and technical education courses demonstrate to students that their community leaders are committed to helping them prepare for a successful life right out of high school. One student I met, Hannah, told me about a recreation and tourism project that involves starting a hospitality business. She is working to expand her line of cupcakes to meet customer demands.

I note that the Presiding Officer has a great interest, as I do, in promoting recreation. That is why I have introduced the RNR bill, the Recreation Not Red-Tape Act.

I was struck by Hannah's expertise.

I note that the Presiding Officer probably saw this last Sunday. The Denver Post had an extraordinary article describing recreation as the economic engine of the future. I am not saying that just because they were kind to the RNR bill, but they talked about the promise of recreation and tourism, particularly for our part of the world.

I was so impressed with Hannah. I said: I am going to send you the RNR bill, and I would appreciate it if you and your colleagues would look for additional ways to cut the red-tape and promote recreation and tourism in Oregon, and throughout the West, and support our existing and future businesses.

The fact is that too many of our students are not graduating high school on time and far too many are unprepared for the workforce. Research has shown that students enrolled in career and technical education courses graduate from high school at a higher rate. In fact, the students at Hermiston High School told me their homebuilders program made them want to show up for school.

I am committed to increasing graduation rates in Oregon and across the country, and I think one of the best ways to do it is to support programs like the one in Hermiston, because I think it is tailor-made to achieve this goal.

Funding for Perkins Career and Technical Education Act courses is a way to make sure that programs like the one I just saw at Hermiston can be started around the country, but funding for these programs has been decreasing since 1998. At the same time, there is bipartisan consensus that career and technical education programs are important, not just for kids who want to be homebuilders but for all students. It seems to me that in overhauling the failed policies of No Child Left Behind, the Senate made a choice to move away from the era of overtested ''bubble kids'' and towards an era of well-rounded, multi-skilled high school graduates. I am glad to see that the Senate HELP Committee is working hard on a proposal to reauthorize this career and technical education program, known as the Perkins Act. The last time it was reauthorized was in 1998. So I am going to work closely with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to keep pushing for a new bill.

The fact is that the educators I saw last week are ambitious by any measure. They saw that their students were not graduating with the skills necessary to be successful in their future school and work lives. So the local educators started partnerships with local architects, engineers, and other professionals. They created a unique program that blends innovative classroom instruction with real-world application. We have businesses directly engaging with young people. Not only do they show what kinds of jobs are available in the community, but they also prove that school is an important stepping-stone in preparing students for the real world.

I have been in public service for a while. It is such a tremendous honor to represent Oregon in the Senate. But I will tell you, watching the way a small community in eastern Oregon, Hermiston, has come together and made a commitment to their young people is special. It is truly what we call the Oregon way.

I will close by way of saying that I am grateful to the school, Hermiston High School, for allowing me to visit. I will do everything I can to take the student homebuilder program that I saw last week and spread the word about what the potential is here. They already sold one house for a very healthy price, and I think we would be wise—again here in the Senate, Democrats and Republicans—to come together and support career technical education programs like the ones I saw in Hermiston and urge all of us here in the Senate, on a bipartisan basis, to support Federal and State assistance for these kinds of programs, career and technical education programs, for even more students from one end of our country to the other.

With that, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FRANK R. LAUTENBERG CHEMICAL SAFETY FOR THE 21ST CENTURY ACT

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, for some time, including times on this floor, I have said that the choice between a clean environment and a strong economy is a false one. Some people say you can't have a clean environment and a strong economy at the same time. I just don't think that is correct. TSCA is an acronym for Toxic Substances Control Act.

The TSCA reform legislation that we approved in this body last night is proof of the fact that we can have a cleaner, safer, and healthier environment and also have a strong economy. They go together, and maybe, when I finish my remarks, folks will understand why that might be true.

Every day in this country manufacturers use a variety of chemicals. I am told there are tens of thousands of chemicals on this planet. It is in the air, in the ground, in the water, and in our bodies. Manufacturers use these chemicals to make everything from carpets—like the carpet we are standing on—to cosmetics, water bottles, and dish washing soap.

Former President Gerald Ford signed the Toxic Substances Control Act of 1976 and said it was landmark legislation. He said that this is huge legislation in terms of protecting the environment and public health. He said it was intended to give the EPA the authority to monitor, test, and regulate the chemicals that pose a risk to human health or the environment. That was the deal. Over the past four decades, since Gerald Ford signed that legislation into law, the Toxic Substances Control Act has never worked as intended, leaving the public at risk for toxic exposures and the private sector with a broken regulatory process that has undermined innovation. Frankly, it led to a lot of uncertainty and lack of predictability.

As a recovering Governor, I know that among the things we need in order to have a better and more nurturing environment for job creation and job preservation is to make certain that businesses, whether large or small, have predictability and certainty. When the Toxic Substances Control Act passed 40 years ago, it did not provide that predictability and certainty.

In fact, for the last 40 years, I think the EPA has fully vetted six toxic substances. Imagine that—six in 40 years. In the last 20 to 25 years, there were none. In the meantime, States have stood up and said: If the Federal Government is not going to do it, we will do it. Now we have a patchwork quilt of State requirements. We have businesses—not just chemical businesses but a wide variety of businesses—in this country that are trying to comply with laws in dozens of States, and the Federal standard that we set 40 years ago just does not work.

For a while, the Toxic Substances Control Act has been broken. That is a polite way of saying it. Over the past 39 years, we have learned a lot more about toxic chemicals. We have learned about how they can cause harm to our environment. They can cause harm to public health, and we also learned how best to identify and protect against these risks.

More than 3 years ago, two of my colleagues—one a Democrat, TOM UDALL of New Mexico, and the other a Republican, DAVE VITTER of Louisiana—wrote something called the Frank R. Lautenberg Chemical Safety for the 21st Century Act. That is a mouthful, isn't it?

Frank R. Lautenberg was a Senator from New Jersey for many years, whose birthday I remember to this day. He is now deceased, but his birthday is January 23, and the reason why I know that is because that is when my birthday is. This is an issue we actually shared a strong interest in doing something about.

My recollection—it is hard to remember when people move around from desk to desk—is that his seat was back here behind where I am standing today.

My colleagues TOM UDALL and DAVID VITTER wrote a bill and named it after Frank R. Lautenberg because this is an issue he cared a lot about. He tried several times to write legislation that could be enacted to take the 40-year-old Toxic Substances Control Act from 1976 and bring it into the 21st century and help it become effective and make sense for the digital age.

The bill written by Senators UDALL and VITTER reforms the old Toxic Substances Control Act, and it does it in ways to better protect the public—to protect us, our families, our businesses, and so forth. It is also designed to create a more manageable regulatory framework for American businesses and innovators so they have some predictability and certainty with what they are dealing with. Whether they happen to be doing business in Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, Wyoming, Idaho, or California, they would have some certainty as to what the rules of the road were going to be for toxic substances or the chemicals they might be using in their processes.

After the bill was introduced by Senators VITTER and UDALL, I worked closely with both of them for more than a year as a member of the Environment and Public Works Committee. We led a number of meetings, had many discussions, and we were always

focused on securing enhanced protections for public health and the environment while providing certainty and predictability for American businesses.

I focused especially on language to secure provisions that would protect children, pregnant women, and workers from toxic risk. The provisions I especially focused on included ensuring that the EPA had access to information in order for them to assess safety risks.

A third area that I looked at was to enact something to allow States to enforce Federal toxic safety law. If the EPA wasn't doing its job, could there be a State backstop in a way that made sense? I think that was not an unreasonable thing to ask. We did that in Dodd-Frank with respect to nationally chartered banks. If the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency in nationally chartered banks is not making sure consumers are being looked after, then we allow State attorneys general—not to write regulations or their own law but to enforce Federal standards and laws. I wanted to make sure that in the event that someday we had an EPA that frankly wouldn't enforce a new version of the substance control act, then States could enforce it for them.

Chemical manufacturers and consumers alike deserve legal clarity, a timely review process, and the ability to trust that products people use every day are safe. I might add that when Senator UDALL and Senator VITTER started to introduce this legislation and started to gather cosponsors—I don't mean to be presumptuous, but my guess is the Presiding Officer probably ended up as a cosponsor. At the end of the day, we had 30 Democrats and 30 Republicans. The idea was to add a Democrat, add a Republican, add a Democrat, add a Republican—a little bit of a look at how a bill is made or should be made. It is almost a textbook example of how legislation could be formed or should be formed, even on a difficult and contentious issue like the one I am talking about today.

I was involved at the very beginning in the initial efforts to rewrite the Toxic Substance Control Act. I was involved with DAVID VITTER and TOM UDALL and also the chairman of the committee, JIM INHOFE. But I got to a point where I said to the coauthors of the legislation—they were looking for cosponsors, and I said: I will be willing to cosponsor your version of the rewriting of the Toxic Substance Control Act, but there are 10 changes that I would like to consider making.

They said: What are they?

I said: Well, here they are.

And I gave them some idea of what they were. They asked me to put them in writing, so I put them in writing in a letter to Senators VITTER and UDALL and said: These are the changes I would like to see made in the bill you have introduced. If you will make these changes or agree to these changes, I will cosponsor your bill, and not only will I cosponsor your bill, but so will 10 or 11 other Democrats. We all signed the letter. This was probably about a year and a half ago.

The letter was more to Senator VITTER than Senator UDALL; I think it went to both. But to his credit, Senator VITTER and his staff went through it piece by piece, proposal by proposal—all 10 of them. At the end of the day, they agreed essentially with all of them, and they said that they would incorporate all 10 of the proposals in the bill. They said: Now will you cosponsor the bill?

And I said: Yes, I will. And so did the rest of us who signed the letter—all 10 of us.

When I said that I would cosponsor the bill, I also said there were three areas that still needed some work. My passion for pushing for this legislation will be tempered somewhat by your willingness to also act on subsequent changes in the bill in these three areas. I will not go into those three areas, but I will say that later on, some of my colleagues—Senators CORY BOOKER, Senator WHITEHOUSE, Senator JEFF MERKLEY, and Senator ED MARKEY—sort of stepped up and said: We are interested in those three areas, and we want to see further changes made in the bill.

With those changes, we added even more cosponsors, and finally we ended up with 60. We said: Let's take that bill to the Senate. It reported out of committee and eventually worked through the Senate. It was not easy, but we finally got it done. We went to conference with the House, and, lo and behold, we passed a conference report unanimously last night by unanimous consent, and nobody objected. Considering how controversial this bill has been for years, that is amazing.

At a press conference we held today with the principal Democrats and Republicans in the Senate, one of the House Members came over. Senator TOM UDALL talked about how he felt elated to be able to unanimously pass a contentious bill after all these years. He likened it to standing on a mountaintop. He is a mountain climber. In New Mexico they have some tall mountains, and he said it was like standing on a mountain top. He said: I feel elation when I climb to the top of a tall mountain and stand atop the mountain. And he said this morning at the press conference that he felt elation as well.

Then, when I spoke after Senator UDALL, I said that in Delaware we don't have tall mountains. Delaware is the lowest lying State in America. We really worry about climate change and sea levels rising. Besides that being some theory, it is something that we worry about. So the highest part of land in Delaware is a bridge. Every now and again, if I want to go up high and climb something, I can climb the bridge, but it is not really that high.

The thing that gave me elation in Delaware when I was Governor—and before that the State treasurer and all—was when we all worked together. Delaware has a tradition; we call it the Delaware way. It is where Democrats and Republicans work together, set aside partisan differences, and just ask: What is the right thing to do?

Delaware is a small State. We can get pretty much the key stakeholders in a room and work out a lot of our differences within a couple of hours. It is pretty amazing how it works sometimes.

I share with my colleagues today an African proverb. The Presiding Officer has probably heard this before, and he has probably used this one before. It goes something like this: ''If you want to travel fast, go alone. If you want to travel far, go together.''

Let me say that again. ''If you want to travel fast, go alone. If you want to travel far, go together.''

That is especially true in the Senate. In order to get anything of any consequence done, you need 60 votes. We are at about 55 Republicans, and roughly there are about 45 Democrats with maybe an Independent in there somewhere. So we have to figure out how to travel together.

We have been traveling a long way over the last 4 years or so, but we finally got to our destination, and I think we finally came to a good outcome in terms of the policy we have adopted. For the first time, the legislation that has been agreed to by the House and Senate and will be sent to the President will require that every product used in consumer products will be assessed for safety.

Let me say that again. Every chemical used in consumer products will be assessed for safety. At the same time, our legislation will offer businesses a predictable and manageable regulatory framework—not a whole bunch of different regulatory frameworks, but one—for chemicals that do not pose a safety hazard.

As I said, we have been struggling and negotiating this bill in the Senate for a long time—maybe as much as a half dozen years. There has been a lot of give and take on both sides of the aisle to get to where we are last night and today. We are where we are today because both sides worked together to compromise on policies without compromising on our principles.

I mentioned that Frank Lautenberg used to sit at one of these desks behind me, and so did Ted Kennedy. I will never forget going and having a lunch with him when I was fairly new in the Senate. I wasn't sure that we had the kind of interpersonal relationship that I wanted, and as the Presiding Officer knows, this place works a lot on relationships.

I said to him: Maybe someday I can come to your office and just sit and talk with you for a while and have a cup of coffee.

He said: Why don't you come to my hideaway, and we will have lunch together.

I said: Really?

He said: Yes.

After about a week or two, we went to his hideaway, and we had lunch together. His hideaway was an amazing place. It was almost like a museum in terms of all the things about the Kennedy family and his brothers and his own life.

Among the things we talked about that day was his ability to find compromise and consensus with one of our current colleagues, a guy named MIKE ENZI—a wonderful guy named MIKE ENZI who the Presiding Officer knows is one of two Senators from Wyoming, a former mayor of Gillette, an accountant—I think maybe a CPA. When I was presiding over the Senate years ago, I remember MIKE ENZI coming to the floor of the Senate and speaking about the 80–20 rule and how the 80–20 rule allowed the folks in a committee he served on as the senior Republican called the HELP Committee, or the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee—Ted Kennedy was the senior Democrat on that committee. It was an incredibly productive committee. There were all kinds of bipartisan legislation coming out of it.

Later on that day I asked Senator ENZI off the floor: How do you and Ted Kennedy manage to get so much done in the Senate Health, Education, Labor, and Pension Committee? How do you do that?

He said: It is the 80–20 rule.

I said: What's that?

He said: Ted Kennedy and I agree on about 80 percent of this stuff, and we disagree on the other 20 percent. What we do is we focus on the 80 percent where we agree, and we set aside the other 20 percent to another day and we will figure that out some other time.

When I talked to Ted Kennedy about the same thing, he said: I am always willing to compromise on policy, process, but I just don't want to compromise on my principles. He and MIKE ENZI managed to have an incredibly productive partnership on that committee and here in the Senate.

Senator Kennedy had a similar relationship with ORRIN HATCH, who now chairs the Finance Committee, as we know.

But we are where we are today because both Democrats and Republicans have worked together to compromise on policy without having to compromise our principles. The final product is a testament to a robust and a transparent committee process. I think it is a textbook example of how we ought to legislate around here. If we can get something that difficult, that complex, and that controversial behind us in an appropriate way and get support from environmental groups, business groups, Democrats and Republicans, maybe there are some other things we can get done, and God knows we need to.

I am proud of the work we have done together to reach this historic agreement. In addition to thanking Senator UDALL, Senator VITTER, and the chairman of the Environment and Public Works Committee, Senator INHOFE, I also want to say a special thank-you to the members of our staff. I think those of us who serve or are privileged to work here as Senators work hard, but on this issue—and some of us worked hard on this issue, but the folks who really worked hard on this issue are the members of our staff. I will not go through the names of all the folks who worked with this Senator and that Senator, but I just want to say to those of you who know who you are, thank you. You have done great work, and you have enabled us to do the people's work.

I would say to a fellow who was a member of my staff for the last maybe 3 years and who worked day and night on this legislation—a fellow named Colin Peppard who now works for the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority out on the west coast—a special shout out to him and a special thank-you to him for all his efforts.

Mr. President, I think that is pretty much it for me today. It looks as though the Senator from Minnesota is here and has a hungry look on his face. He hungers to share something with all of us.

With that having been said, I will yield the floor to Senator FRANKEN of Minnesota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. FRANKEN. I thank my good friend from Delaware.

NOMINATION OF MERRICK GARLAND

Mr. President, I rise today to address the nomination of Chief Judge Merrick Garland to the U.S. Supreme Court. Today marks 84 days since President Obama nominated Judge Garland to fill the vacant seat on the Supreme Court bench. In that time the consequences of permitting that vacancy to persist have become clear. The eight-member Court has now deadlocked four times, and in two cases where the Court found itself evenly divided and unable to reach consensus it punted, sending cases back to the lower courts.

There is no denying that the Senate's refusal to do its job, to take up the business of filling that vacancy, means that in some cases the Court is not able to fulfill its core function, meaning in some cases the Court does not resolve circuit splits and cannot serve as the final arbiter of the law. That is not just my view, that is an opinion shared by one of the Court's current members, Associate Justice Anthony Kennedy. Testifying before the House Appropriations Committee back in 2013, Justice Kennedy described what happens when the Court is short-staffed. Although he is discussing the effect of recusals on the ability of the Court to do its job, his comments are no less relevant in the case of vacancies. This is what Justice Kennedy said: ''On our Court, if we recuse without absolutely finding it necessary to do so, then you might have a 4–4 Court, and everybody's time is wasted.''

Let me say that again. ''Everybody's time is wasted.'' Well, my Republican colleagues don't seem to be bothered by wasting everybody's time.

Mr. President, 116 days ago, less than an hour after the news of Justice Scalia's death, the majority leader proclaimed that the Senate would not consider a replacement until after the Presidential election and said that ''the American people should have a voice in the selection of their next Supreme Court Justice.''

In the 116 days since the majority leader made that bold announcement, Republican Senator after Republican Senator has taken to the Senate floor to deliver variations on that theme. My good friend Senator CORNYN helpfully explained that Senate Republicans had made a decision to ''give the voters a voice on who makes the next lifetime appointment to the Supreme Court.'' He said, ''I want to be clear that the American people do deserve a voice here and we will make sure that they are heard.''

We have been through this before. We agree. The American people should have a voice in this process. They did. They elected Barack Obama to be President of the United States. By my read of the Constitution—article II, section 1, to be exact—the President shall ''hold his office during the term of 4 years''—a term which has not yet expired.

It seems clear to me that in the text of our founding documents, our democracy was designed to ensure that its citizens have a voice in this process. President Ronald Reagan made this point quite eloquently when he presided over the swearing in of not just William Rehnquist as Chief Justice of the Supreme Court but also one Antonin Scalia as Associate Justice. President Reagan explained that ''the Founding Fathers recognized that the Constitution is the supreme and ultimate expression of the will of the American people.'' Of course, President Reagan was right. The Founding Fathers recognized that the very purpose of the Constitution was to embody the spirit and the voice of the American people.

I find it preposterous when my Republican colleagues, who purport to revere the Constitution and the Framer's original intent, insist that the only way to guarantee that the people's voice is heard is to delay filling the vacancy, because, after all, the Founding Fathers did not just contemplate such a situation, they actually experienced it.

When President John Adams—himself a Founding Father and a drafter of the Declaration of Independence—was presented with the opportunity to appoint a Supreme Court Justice, he himself was a lameduck President. The Chief Justice at the time, Oliver Ellsworth, resigned after the 1800 Presidential election—an election that

President Adams lost. Nevertheless, Adams set about the work of selecting a replacement. When he eventually nominated John Marshall in January of 1801, more than 2 months after losing the election to a President of a different party—and the country still did not know who that would be because Thomas Jefferson and Aaron Burr had tied, but they were not his political party. Despite an unresolved election and in the face of great uncertainty, Adams nominated Justice Marshall, and the Senate took up John Marshall's nomination and confirmed him to the post of Chief Justice on January 27, 1801, by voice vote.

John Adams was by every definition of the term a lameduck President. The Senate could have refused to fill the vacancy. They could have left the Supreme Court short-staffed. Senators could have insisted that the seat not be filled until it was clear just exactly whom the American people had selected as their next President. But the Senate recognized that it had a constitutional obligation to confirm a replacement. That should come as no surprise because of the 32 Senators serving in the Sixth Congress, 5 of them had been delegates to the Constitutional Convention: Abraham Baldwin of Georgia; Jonathan Dayton of New Jersey; John Langdon of New Hampshire; Gouverneur Morris of New York, whose first name was Gouverneur, but he wasn't a Governor; his mother's maiden name was Gouverneur; and Charles Pinckney of South Carolina. All of them are real Founding Fathers. If anyone should have known what the Constitution required in this situation, it was they.

Now, picture them milling about the floor of the Old Senate Chamber on January 27, 1801, talking amongst themselves and their colleagues and whipping votes. At the time, the Senate's practice was to consider nominations in an executive session with the doors closed. Only Senators and certain staff were allowed in the Chamber and the proceedings were intended to be secret, so the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD contains no debate on John Marshall's nomination. We can only imagine what Senators said, but I suspect it went something like this:

Well, John, Abraham, Gouverneur, I suppose we should vote now on the President's nomination to the Supreme Court.

Why, yes, Jonathan, of course. I remember when we wrote into the Constitution that when a vacancies occurs, the President shall appoint a nominee to fill the vacancy and we Senators shall provided our advice and consent.

Yes, John, I recall the day we wrote that. You were in a particularly good mood because your wife Betsy had arrived by carriage the night before from New Hampshire.

Yes, Abraham, I recall that well. After all, it was only 13 years ago, and the next day we wrote the provisions about the Supreme Court. I remember very well how specific we were. The President appoints a nominee in the event of a vacancy and we in the Senate do our job by providing advice and consent. So by all means, let's vote.

These men, these Founding Fathers set aside whatever reservations they may have had about the unique circumstances surrounding John Marshall's nomination and a lameduck President of a different party than the party that won the Presidential election. They allowed the Senate to hold a vote. These are the Founding Fathers who wrote the Constitution. As a consequence, John Marshall went on to serve as our Nation's fourth Chief Justice, authoring opinions that make up the foundation of constitutional law. It was obvious to those Founding Fathers in the Senate, as it should be to all of us serving here today, that the Supreme Court is too important, too central to our democracy to ignore.

I urge my colleagues—particularly those motivated by a fidelity to the Framers' original intent—to end their obstruction and grant the President's nominee full and fair consideration.

Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, I rise to speak on amendment No. 4251. I have filed the amendment; I have not yet requested it to be made pending. I would like to see this amendment move through. It seeks to remove the President's authority to deny troops their mandated pay raise.

The issue of paying our troops should not be a partisan issue any longer. We have fought this battle for too many years on the Senate floor. This year I put forth a bipartisan solution with my colleague from Montana, JON TESTER, and with Senators RUBIO, PORTMAN, and BOOZMAN. It is a long-term solution.

Since 2004, the President has been required by law to give troops a pay raise matching the Employment Cost Index, also called the ECI, but when we mandated that the President raise troop pay with the ECI, we gave the ability for an exemption; that is, when the country is facing serious economic conditions or for matters of national security.

Now, citing economic conditions, the President has used this exemption the past 3 years and he used it again this year—all while citing a growing economy. What happens is our troops are not getting the pay raise that Congress says they should, matching the ECI. When we are facing economic uncertainty, that is when our troops need it the most.

The amendment is very clear cut. It removes the President's authority and future Presidents' authority to cite economic concerns when sending over a Presidential budget request without the mandated pay raise. It is clear that this exemption is being abused. For example, in 2016, in his State of the Union Address, President Obama said that ''anyone claiming that America's economy is in decline is peddling fiction.'' But just 1 month later, in his fiscal year 2017 budget request he sent to Congress, President Obama cited ''economic concerns affecting the general welfare'' and only asked for a 1.6-percent pay raise for our troops, despite the ECI being 2.1 percent.

As we continue to debate this bill and call up amendments, I urge my colleagues to support amendment 4251. Again, we have good bipartisan support on it. This is a long-term solution. This is not just about the current President, this is about future Presidents as well and the problems we continue to face; that is, our troops have not seen a pay raise over 2 percent in the past 6 years. As our Nation continues to find itself threatened abroad, we rely on our troops now more than ever. They deserve better. It is time to act.

I thank Senator TESTER, Senator RUBIO, Senator PORTMAN, and Senator BOOZMAN for their support.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I rise today to speak in support of an amendment offered by the senior Senator from Alaska, Ms. MURKOWSKI, to strike the changes to the basic allowance for housing, or BAH, that are proposed in section 604 of the Defense authorization bill. This amendment is very similar to one I filed this year as well as one I sponsored last year.

Currently, each servicemember receives a housing stipend based on his or her rank, geographic location, and dependency status. Under section 604, however, this part of the military compensation package would no longer be considered a cash allowance. Instead, servicemembers would be compensated on an actual cost basis similar to the system that was in place in the 1990s, which resulted in a burdensome and inefficient administrative approval process.

Notably, the 2015 Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission established by the fiscal year 2013 National Defense Authorization Act examined the issue of allowances as it assessed the military's compensation and retirement system. The Commission found that the current allowance system strikes an appropriate balance in providing compensation to military members and assistance for their living expenses. The Commission deliberately chose not to recommend any changes to the allowance system, and this view is shared by the Department of Defense. In fact, the Secretary of the Navy called me today to express to his concerns about this provision.

In its Statement of Administration Policy, the administration notes that it strongly objects to section 604, which, in its words, ''would inappropriately penalize some servicemembers over others by linking their BAH payments to their status as members of dual-military couples''—in other

words, members of our military who are married to other servicemembers. Under section 604, both members of a dual military couple would be provided a lesser compensation package than other members of equal grade, sending a message that their service is not as highly valued.

The Statement Of Administration Policy went on to note that ''Section 604 would disproportionately affect female servicemembers and those military families in which both military members have chosen to serve their country.'' Twenty percent of servicewomen are married to other servicemembers. By comparison, only 3.8 percent—in other words, less than 4 percent of Active-Duty men—are married to other servicemembers. Thus, women are five times more likely to be affected by this reduction in housing allowances than their male counterparts—five times more likely for the women servicemembers to be affected because they are more likely to be married to servicemembers.

This proposed change would similarly penalize our junior servicemembers who are more likely to live with another servicemember as a roommate to help defray the cost-of-living expenses. As such, this provision could have a profound implication for both recruitment and retention of our all-volunteer force and discourage our best and our brightest from staying in the service.

I do recognize that the Department's personnel costs are a budget concern, but finding savings that unfairly single out some military members is not the way to do it, particularly when one considers the growing role women servicemembers are playing and which I strongly support and admire.

Last year I spearheaded a successful movement to remove a similar provision from the fiscal year 2016 NDAA. I am disappointed to see that this proposal has resurfaced again this year. I am pleased to work with my colleague from Alaska Senator MURKOWSKI to remove a provision that I believe is both unfair and harmful.

I do recognize the very difficult task the Senate Armed Services Committee had in putting together this bill. I commend both the chairman, Senator MCCAIN, and the ranking member, Senator JACK REED, for their terrific work on so many issues. I do hope they will look again at this particular cut in the basic housing allowance and support our amendment.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEE). The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO BILLY LAWLESS

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, we all know the Senate of the United States is composed of two Senators from each State. Today I have news. My home State of Illinois just picked up a third senator.

Last month, the Irish Prime Minister—Taoiseach—Enda Kenny, announced eight appointees to the Irish Senate. One of the appointees is my dear friend in Chicago, Billy Lawless.

Billy is the first Irish citizen living in the United States to be appointed to the Irish Senate. This is truly historic. Today Billy takes a seat in the Irish Senate. Ireland will get a senator who will fight for the disenfranchised, the dispossessed, and those yearning to work hard for a better life.

No one has been a stronger voice and advocate for the Irish diaspora and immigration reform than Billy Lawless of Chicago, IL. Prime Minister Kenny couldn't have made a better choice.

For generations, sons and daughters of the Emerald Isle have landed on our shores in search of the American dream. Billy Lawless is no different. As a young boy, he grew up on a dairy farm in Galway, a city in western Ireland, delivering unpasteurized milk to local restaurants and hotels.

As an adult, he made a name for himself as a prominent businessman in Galway. He ran several pubs, restaurants, and hotels. Life was good, but for years he had always had a dream of opening a restaurant in the United States. When his youngest daughter earned a full college scholarship in the United States, Billy took that as a sign from Heaven. He moved his family to America. After 48 years in Galway, he wanted to see if he could succeed in the United States and he personally could live the American dream.

He first went to Boston and Philadelphia, but on December 31, 1997, New Year's Eve, a historic day, Billy Lawless arrived in Chicago and knew he had found a home. From Galway, that most Irish of Irish cities, to Chicago, the most Irish of American cities, it was a perfect transition.

Within 6 months, Billy opened an establishment known as Irish Oak, just a couple blocks south of Wrigley Field. Today he owns four restaurants and a fifth one is about to open. All the Lawless restaurants are known for three things—great food, great fun, and great people.

Simply put, the Lawless family is restaurant royalty in Chicago. The family business started with 10 employees. Now they have 300. Since arriving in Chicago nearly 20 years ago, Billy has brought new energy to the city—Irish energy—hard work, and a stubborn drive to succeed. With the great help of his great wife Anne and his four children—Billy, Jr., Amy, John Paul, and Clodagh—Billy achieved the American dream.

Billy could have said: I have achieved my American dream. Good luck with yours.

That is not who he is. After all, Billy is Irish. He looks out for his friends and neighbors.

The first bar Billy opened, the Irish Oak, became a favorite for Irish construction workers. Many of them were undocumented and asked for Billy's help in getting their papers in order. Billy never hesitated. He became their champion and a strong defender of Irish immigrants everywhere. When asked why he took such an interest in the issue, he said: ''That's what we Irish do for each other.'' But he didn't stop there. When he learned that those same problems were shared by others, Billy became an eloquent and forceful advocate for all immigrants.

Billy Lawless gets it. He understands that protecting immigrants' rights is part of the strength of our immigrant Nation. I know he will continue to be an energetic and compassionate guardian of the Irish diaspora and all immigrants' rights from his seat in the Irish Senate.

The United States and Ireland have long and proud histories, forged in the fires of a proud and rebellious spirit and united in friendship. Having Billy Lawless's unique and authentic voice in the Irish Senate will only strengthen our countries here and abroad. He represents the very best of the both the Irish and American spirit.

It was only 2 years ago that I came to the Senate floor to congratulate Billy and his wife Anne on becoming citizens of the United States. They had waited a long time, and they had worked hard for it. I was proud to call them not just my friends but my fellow Americans. Today I am proud to call Billy Lawless my fellow Senator.

Congratulations on a well-deserved honor.

INDEPENDENCE OF OUR FEDERAL JUDICIARY

Mr. President, I rise to address an issue of serious constitutional gravity. I rise to address the latest in a long line of appalling and insulting remarks made by the Republican Party's presumptive Presidential nominee.

Last week Donald Trump attacked the ethnicity of U.S. district court judge Gonzalo Curiel, who is presiding over a civil fraud lawsuit against Trump's so-called university.

Mr. Trump referred to Judge Curiel's heritage in a lengthy tirade about the judge's ruling in the case. He also called Judge Curiel a ''hater'' and ''a total disgrace,'' suggesting that the judge should recuse himself due to his ''negative'' rulings.

When pressed on the issue, Mr. Trump doubled down. In an interview with the Wall Street Journal published last Thursday, Mr. Trump stated that Judge Curiel had ''an absolute conflict'' in presiding over the lawsuit because the judge is of ''Mexican heritage.''

Mr. Trump went on to explain that the judge's ethnicity presents an ''inherent conflict of interest'' because of Mr. Trump's campaign pledge to build a wall on the U.S. border with Mexico.

Let me be clear. Mr. Trump's attacks on Judge Curiel have been characterized—even by Republican Senators and Congressmen—as racist, inappropriate, and completely unfounded.

Judge Curiel is an American. He was born in East Chicago, IN, just steps

away from the border with my State. His parents had emigrated from Mexico to the United States.

He has a distinguished record. After attending law school at Indiana University, Judge Curiel practiced law in Indiana and California. In 1989, he joined the U.S. Attorney's office in the Southern District of California.

As a Federal prosecutor, Judge Curiel served in the Narcotics Enforcement Division and worked to bring down drug cartels. After prosecuting a major cartel, he received a death threat and was forced to live under guard for months.

In 2007, he was appointed by a Republican Governor in California to serve as a State judge. President Obama later nominated Judge Curiel to the Federal bench. The Senate confirmed his nomination by a unanimous vote on September 22, 2012.

Judge Curiel is well respected in the legal community. A former colleague recently said: ''His integrity is beyond reproach.'' And a California attorney who led the screening committee that reviewed Judge Curiel in 2011 said:

He was very highly recommended. No one could say a bad thing about him.

Despite these accomplishments, Donald Trump views Judge Curiel as incapable of serving as an impartial jurist in this case involving Trump University due to the judge's ethnicity. Mr. Trump believes the lawsuit that Judge Curiel is presiding over should have been dismissed long ago. Maybe Mr. Trump should take a closer look at reality.

Multiple lawsuits have been filed against Mr. Trump's so-called university, and in one of the two lawsuits that Judge Curiel is presiding over, former students allege that Mr. Trump and Trump University defrauded them by making misrepresentations about the education they would receive.

The plaintiffs provided evidence to support their claims and, as a result, Judge Curiel denied a motion from Mr. Trump to grant summary judgment in his favor, which would have avoided a trial. Nothing in this ruling suggests a lack of impartiality. Instead, Judge Curiel's rulings indicate that a factual dispute exists in the case and the plaintiffs deserve their day in court.

Unfortunately, reality and the facts don't seem to matter to Mr. Trump. Instead of acknowledging the inappropriateness of his attacks on Judge Curiel's character and heritage, he has doubled down on them. Mr. Trump apparently believes that after he bullies and demeans a group of people, he should never have to face a member of that community in a courtroom.

One of Mr. Trump's most reprehensible statements—and there are many—calls for a total and complete ban on Muslim immigrants coming to the United States of America. In an interview that aired on ''Face the Nation'' on Sunday, Mr. Trump was asked:

If it were a Muslim judge, would you also feel like they wouldn't be able to treat you fairly because of that policy of yours?

He responded:

It's possible, yes. Yeah. That would be possible, absolutely.

Where does Mr. Trump's twisted logic end? Does his crude attack on a disabled reporter present a conflict of interest for a judge with a disability who presides over a case against him? Do his disparaging remarks about women disqualify female judges from ruling on lawsuits filed against his failed business ventures?

Mr. Trump's assertions are not only bigoted, they also endanger the independence of the Federal judiciary as he aspires to the highest office in the land. Despite those concerns, Senate Republicans are keeping 89 Federal judicial seats vacant, including an empty seat on the U.S. Supreme Court, in the hopes that Donald Trump will be able to fill those vacancies.

After Mr. Trump's racist diatribes, I would like to ask my colleagues how they can possibly trust Mr. Trump to appoint judges to the Federal bench. Are they comfortable with a potential President who apparently believes that the only qualified candidates for Federal judgeships are those who possess racial, religious, or other characteristics that he has not yet disparaged?

Trusting Donald Trump to fill judgeships in our Nation's Federal courtrooms is a risky and constitutionally dangerous bet. Placing that trust in Trump would threaten grave harm to our system of justice and to our rule of law.

I thought—or had hoped—that we had moved past the dark time in our Nation's history when defendants believed it was appropriate to try to remove judges from a lawsuit on the basis of race. It was just over 40 years ago that an African-American Federal judge named A. Leon Higginbotham, Jr. presided over a class action lawsuit involving civil rights claims.

The defendants in the lawsuit filed motions to disqualify Judge Higginbotham from the case based on his race. In his opinion denying their motions, Judge Higginbotham wrote the following:

It would be a tragic day for the nation and the judiciary if a myopic vision of the judge's role should prevail, a vision that required judges to refrain from participating in their churches, in their non-political community affairs, in their universities. So long as Jewish judges preside over matters where Jewish and Gentile litigants disagree; so long as Protestant judges preside over matters where Protestant and Catholic litigants disagree; so long as White judges preside over matters where White and Black litigants disagree, I will preside over matters where Black and White litigants disagree.

In light of Mr. Trump's reprehensible remarks, Judge Higginbotham's words have taken on a renewed resonance. If Mr. Trump's myopic vision for the Federal judiciary prevails, it will indeed be a tragic day for the Nation.

I yield the floor.

Mr. ISAKSON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, if the Senator from Georgia would yield for me to make a unanimous consent request.

Mr. ISAKSON. I yield.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be recognized following the remarks of the Senator from Georgia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Georgia

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished Senator from Alaska, Ms. MURKOWSKI, be allowed to follow the Senator from Vermont.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

VETERANS FIRST ACT

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, last week, the Attorney General of the United States sent a letter to KEVIN MCCARTHY, the majority leader of the House, to inform Mr. MCCARTHY and all of us, that she would not defend the administration on the constitutional challenge to the firing of Sharon Helman, the director of the Arizona hospital of the Veterans' Administration.

The firing took place because Ms. Helman had manipulated the books and overseen the manipulation of appointments to the point where as many as 40 veterans waiting in line to get their first appointment died before they were ever seen by the VA. She was convicted by a court of law for taking illegal gratuities in her position as director of the hospital.

Ms. Helman filed a constitutional challenge as to whether we had the ability in the administration to fire her constitutionally, and Loretta Lynch has said she is not going to defend the United States or the law we passed, called the Veterans Accountability and Choice Act, which calls for the firing of employees by the Secretary of the Veterans' Administration for cause.

Today, in Phoenix, AZ, it was announced that the Veterans' Administration is firing three more employees of the Veterans' Administration hospital. Yet, in the shadow of that, Loretta Lynch is telling America she will not defend the country on the carrying out of the laws we pass in this country, in this body, and that the President of the United States has signed.

There is a solution to this problem, Mr. President. It is called the Veterans First Act, which was written originally by 19 members of the Senate—all members of the Veterans' Affairs Committee. It has been signed and cosponsored by 43 other Members of the Senate and once and for all ends the hide-and-go-seek that takes place at the Veterans' Administration. It takes the Veterans' Administration out from

under the Merit Systems Protection Board for all senior executive leadership. In other words, the 434 senior executives in the Veterans' Administration now protected by the Merit Systems Protection Board no longer would be protected by that Board but instead would be subject to the Secretary's firing or the Secretary's hiring. Any appeal for actions taken on behalf of the Secretary will be to the Secretary, not to the Merit Systems Protection Board.

The American people and the brave veterans who have fought and sacrificed for this country deserve the right to know that if they are injured by the Veterans' Administration or if the Veterans' Administration is not carrying out what it is supposed to do for them, we will take action, and we will be effective.

I resent the fact that the Attorney General of the United States has chosen not to defend a constitutional challenge to our authority, which this Congress passed and our President signed to give that authority to Secretary Bob McDonald and whoever would follow him as Secretary of the VA.

But that is not the only thing in the Veterans First Act. For the first time ever, we are going to give caregiver benefits to Vietnam-era veterans—22,500 handicapped veterans—who today can't get the same benefits that post-9/11 vets can get. That is wrong, and we are taking care of that.

We are dealing with the opioid problem that started at the Tomah hospital in Wisconsin. We are correcting that and putting in good standards for the use of opioids and the prescription of opioids and therapies to get people off opioids.

We are cleaning up the mental health access situation to improve mental health access for all our veterans. We are giving the type of discipline to the leaders of the Veterans' Administration to see to it that our hospitals are run like they should be, our veterans get the services they deserve, and we give to our veterans who return home after fighting for us the best quality health care and the most responsive health care system we can possibly provide.

I urge the Presiding Officer and the other Members of the Senate to join with me when our bill comes to the floor and to pass the Veterans First Act. It brings about real accountability in the Veterans' Administration, real choice for our veterans, and real care for our Vietnam veterans. It addresses the opioid problem and once and for all provides for a comprehensive reform for the Veterans' Administration, which hasn't taken place in decades and decades.

I commend the members of the Veterans' Affairs Committee for their leadership. I thank the Presiding Officer for the time, and I yield to the distinguished Senator from Vermont.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I thank my distinguished colleague from Georgia.

AMENDMENT NO. 4549

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, Senator MCCAIN, the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, believes that $602 billion is not enough for the Department of Defense. Rather than reject unnecessary spending for weapons and other programs the Pentagon says it does not want or need, the Senator from Arizona not only says we should fund them, he also proposes to spend another $18 billion on defense.

I will leave it to others to defend or contest the assumptions on which Senator MCCAIN's amendment is based. But I do want to speak briefly in support of the second degree amendment offered by the ranking member of the Armed Services Committee, Senator REED of Rhode Island.

Because if there is one thing we have learned over and over, it is that protecting U.S. national security is not only about a strong military that can respond when all other options fail. It is also about homeland security, including border control and maintaining critical infrastructure. It is about law enforcement within the United States. It is about cyber security. It is about educating the next generation of Americans and creating jobs that lead to advancements in science and technology. And it is about strengthening the capabilities of foreign partners and acting as a leader in international diplomatic efforts to prevent and respond to threats to global security.

The fiscal year 2017 budget allocation for the Department of State and foreign operations is $591 million below fiscal year 2016. That, coupled with the fact that the President's budget underfunds programs for refugees and other victims of disasters by $1 billion, presents us with an untenable budgetary situation. The amendment offered by the Senator from Rhode Island would help to alleviate this shortfall.

While there are many foreign crises, Senator REED's amendment focuses on one area where the situation is particularly dire. It authorizes $1.9 billion to support the Department of State and U.S. Agency for International Development to implement their portions of the Integrated Campaign Plan to Counter ISIL. The funds would also support embassy security, as well as additional assistance for Israel, and for Jordan and Lebanon which have been severely impacted by the influx of hundreds of thousands of Syrian refugees.

This is directly related to U.S. security interests in the Middle East at a time when the stability of the entire region is under threat.

In a June 2 piece in Time Magazine, Retired GEN James Conway, former Commandant of the Marine Corps, and Retired ADM James M. Loy, former Commandant of the U.S. Coast Guard, wrote that:

. . . the security challenges our nation faces today are not the same as when we began our service during the Cold War. . . . Twenty-first century problems require fine scalpels, and the military is a broad sword. We can start by better resourcing and strengthening our own institutions. The State Department, the Peace Corps and USAID are the front lines of keeping our country safe, but they are underfunded and undermanned.

Mr. President, we should also remember that the Balanced Budget Act is based on parity. The spending caps we put in place have consequences for both the defense and nondefense sides of the ledger. Yet the Senator from Arizona's one dimensional approach ignores this bipartisan compromise. His amendment ignores the essential roles that development and diplomacy play in national security. It ignores the many domestic components to a strong defense, like a well-trained workforce and reliable infrastructure, like energy independence, like health systems that have the resources to protect the public from infectious diseases, contaminated drinking water, and unsafe food.

If you ask the American people whether these investments are as important as more fighter planes and warships, they would emphatically answer ''yes''. And that is why the very name of the Balanced Budget Act includes the word ''balanced''.

The amendment of the Senator from Rhode Island should be passed overwhelmingly.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the June 2 article I referred to by General Conway and Admiral Loy.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FORMER MILITARY LEADERS: 3 LESSONS FOR OUR NEXT COMMANDER-IN-CHIEF

(James Conway and James M. Loy, June 2, 2016)

MILITARY ALONE CANNOT KEEP US SAFE

As Hillary Clinton makes a national security speech Thursday and with Trump's recent major foreign policy speech, it's important to remember that the military alone cannot keep us safe. As the former commandants of the Marine Corps and the Coast Guard, we believe our next Commander-in-Chief will also need the civilian tools in our arsenal to keep our nation strong and secure.

For centuries, the blessing of two large oceans on our flanks acted as geographical barriers. But in the modern era, technology has made the world smaller and increasingly interconnected. The recent attacks in Brussels, Paris and San Bernardino, Calif., remind us that global threats do not respect borders, and oceans are not enough to preserve our peace and prosperity.

The security challenges our nation faces today are not the same as when we began our service during the Cold War. National security challenges have become more resistant to bullets. Ebola, the Zika virus, the influx of undocumented children from Latin states, and even the rise of ISIS cannot be resolved only with the force of arms.

If there was one immutable lesson of the Sept. 11 attacks, it is that instability in remote corners of the world can pose a direct threat to our way of life. The rise of ISIS is only a recent example that underscores that reality.

Military force will continue to be a necessary deterrent for the exercise of American

power, but it cannot be the only option. To preserve our flag and freedom, there are three areas where America must do better.

1. We must strengthen not only our soldiers, sailors, Marines, Coast Guard, and airmen but also our diplomats and development experts who are critical to our national security.

Fighting terrorism means more than bombing the Middle East from the air. It means supporting weak or fragile states, increasing foreign military training and assistance, and devoting more resources to fight weapons proliferation. These are battles best fought at the local level with knowledge of cultures, economics and history.

2. We must help create economic opportunities around the world—particularly those where there are security concerns.

Think of America's engagement with Germany, Japan and South Korea in the postwar years. They are now our fourth, fifth, and sixth largest trading partners, respectively. Helping promote rule of law and economic development strengthens our economy here at home.

3. We must strengthen the humanitarian values that undergird American global leadership.

U.S. foreign assistance has helped cut extreme poverty in half since 1990. It has increased life expectancy in the developing world by 33%, afforded two billion people access to clean water, and the number of children in primary school has tripled over the last 25 years.

Pandemics and diseases like Ebola and the Zika virus are more easily defeated in the countries where they originate when those countries have strong health care systems, an educated population and the economic means to combat the virus. We can help build those institutions. To those concerned about the cost of assistance to the developing world, we would submit to you that economic development is cheaper than sending in the military.

Twenty-first century problems require fine scalpels, and the military is a broad sword. We can start by better resourcing and strengthening our own institutions. The State Department, the Peace Corps and USAID are the front lines of keeping our country safe, but they are underfunded and undermanned.

Facing the largest global displacement of people since World War II, we have much more work to do. If we are not helping to support and build up allies and friends, then we are reducing our prospects for success and ceding immense benefits for our own national security.

General James Mattis got it right when he said: ''If you don't fund the State Department fully, then I need to buy more ammunition.''

Keeping all the tools of American national security strong will help save lives and promote global stability and prosperity. Regardless of who is elected in November, a candidate who understands these challenges, and acts accordingly, will be in America's best interests.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I see the distinguished senior Senator from Alaska on the floor, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about an amendment that I have filed to the National Defense Authorization Act. This is amendment No. 4222, and it addresses an issue of great interest to military families not only in my State, where we are proud to host a strong contingent of military that defend our Nation, but this is an issue that really stretches across the country. What we propose in amendment No. 4222 is to strike section 604 of the NDAA, which represents a paradigm shift in the way the basic allowance for housing is paid to our Active-Duty members.

The Department of Defense and our military families have long believed that BAH is part of a total compensation. Effectively, it is part of your paycheck. It is part of what you earn. It is something that you can count on based on where you are posted, what your rank is, and whether you have any dependents. We have seen the BAH be subject to arbitrary and somewhat unfair reductions in recent years. It has unfortunately become the bill payer for other priorities.

BAH is regarded by the Defense Department as a component of a servicemember's total compensation. It is a compensation program. Section 604 turns the BAH into a reimbursement program. So instead of having BAH in your bank account to spend on living expenses as you deem fit, Section 604 essentially requires servicemembers to turn their receipts in to an accounting office and basically plead your entitlement to that reimbursement for the cost of your housing as well as utilities. I suppose alternatively you could take your entitlement and accept the risk that some audit or verification process will require you to pay something back, perhaps a lot back. Section 604 does not explain how this whole verification process will work.

Believe me, when I had an opportunity to visit with military spouses at Fort Wainwright just last week about this, they asked me: How does this reimbursement work? How do I get these utilities statements in for reimbursement? Already there are not enough people to process the basic paperwork that goes on for reimbursement of other expenses like permanent change of station moves. Tell me how this is going to be a better system.

Our military families are very familiar with deep bureaucracy and endure a fair amount of hassle to get what they are already entitled to.

I heard loud and clear from these military spouses the concerns they had about a proposal. They are looking at this as a one-size-fits-all solution; perhaps it is not a well-formed solution and it could have extreme consequences for those who serve in highly rural places, like in Alaska.

The BAH doesn't pay only for housing, it pays for the utilities. BAH pays for lights and heat, but keep in mind what it means to be in a very remote, very rural place. In places like Fairbanks, you are limited in terms of your options for energy, for power. Your costs are high. You could be looking at a home heating fuel bill on a monthly basis that could actually exceed the cost of your mortgage. Think about what that means. You may be in the enviable position of having found a home in a community that you think is affordable. The monthly rent is affordable, the mortgage might be affordable, but if it is an older house, if it is not fully weatherized, if you are on home heating fuel, you may be looking at a situation where you are paying more in utilities than for the cost of your housing.

Another cost you might use your BAH to pay is snow removal. It is not an option to not have your snow removed, and if your spouse is deployed, you need a way to get out of a long driveway. Who is going to be paying for the snow removal? Oftentimes, BAH pays to pump out the septic system, which has to be done on a somewhat quarterly basis because there are so many homes that are not on water and sewer. By the way, when we talk about water, is the cost of hauling water recoverable under this new reimbursement program? When you are not on a water system, you have to get your water from somewhere. Some military families at Fort Wainwright are paying to have water hauled to their homes either by a truck or they go out to the community tap to fill up their tank, but there is a cost associated with that. These spouses are asking me: How is that going to be accommodated under the new BAH plan? Will this be considered part of these allowable reimbursements?

This is all very troubling to me. It was certainly very troubling to the military families I spent time with. It is not like our military families don't have enough to worry about.

One military spouse told me of the situation in her family. She is a licensed attorney in another State. She hasn't been able to get waived in to practice in the State of Alaska. Her husband is an E7 soldier and has been in for 19 years, so effectively two professionals. They have three children. She says she spends about $1,500 a month for food, formula, and diapers for the three small children. She pays $38,000 a year for childcare. Childcare in and around the Fort Wainwright area is very expensive, and she is not able to get reimbursement for childcare because she is not working. She is trying to get a job. But recognizing that they have all these other costs on top of it all, this military spouse—two professionals in the household, three children—tells me her family is WIC eligible.

The stories I hear about our military families who are accessing our community food banks—our military families are worried. They are worried about what is happening at home, the financial issues they are faced with.

This was one concern I heard specifically: If this is a reimbursement system and I have to submit receipts for expenses—expenses that may exceed the cost of housing, exceed the cost of a mortgage, and it takes a long while to get this reimbursement—what happens if I can't pay my bills on time?

My job requires a security clearance? And that security clearance requires that your credit record be absolutely impeccable. How is all this going to work?

There is so much stress, so much anxiety that I heard from these spouses as we were discussing these issues.

When we think about what our military families are worried about, they are focused on the stress that comes with force structure reductions, frequent PCS moves, needing to understand the latest and greatest TRICARE complexity, figuring out whether the old retirement paradigm or the new retirement paradigm is better. And then they have this—yet another layer of complexity with section 604 that just adds to the stress and adds to the anxiety.

We have to be honest with one another. We have to be honest with our military families. The bill before us does not afford those who serve a pay increase that is commensurate with the value of their service. Thankfully, we are working on a fix, and I greatly appreciate the leadership of Senator MCCAIN and his willingness to work with so many of us on these issues that are a concern to our families.

When we look at what is going on now with BAH, I think we are messing with a very significant component of total compensation. That is simply not an appropriate way to thank families who have already suffered through multiple deployments to Iraq and Afghanistan, and now they have to contend with a host of uncertainties created by the rise of ISIL, the tensions on the Korean Peninsula, a resurgent Russia, and an ambitious China. This is not right for our military families.

The Pentagon has issued a Statement of Administration Policy. They are quite clear about where they are on this. They believe section 604 is damaging to the force, and that is why they oppose section 604. It is burdensome to move from a compensation approach to a reimbursement approach. It is inefficient. It appears to completely eliminate the BAH increment presently paid to families with children. It penalizes dual military couples. It disproportionately impacts female servicemembers. Think about it. About 20 percent of women on Active Duty are in a dual military marriage, compared to about 3.8 percent of Active-Duty men. So women on Active Duty are effectively taking a harder hit. And if we think this is not going to have an impact on recruitment and retention—I think we are going to be looking at some second-order consequences with respect to that and also as it relates to administration of the GI bill education benefit.

I mentioned the effective penalty on dual military couples. I know a dual-career military couple. I am very pleased to know that their military career has taken them to some pretty good places and the better news is that they have moved together. One spouse has been selected for promotion to lieutenant colonel 2 years below the zone, which is a very big deal. This week, his wife learned that she, too, has been selected for promotion to lieutenant colonel 1 year below the zone. So we can see that both of these individuals are very high performers, really rock stars when it comes to a competitive promotion environment. They are doing great, but they are looking at the impact section 604 will have on their specific situation as a dual military couple. They estimate that if their next assignment is here in the lower 48, they will lose about $20,000 from their compensation. If we are fortunate that they should both get assigned to Alaska on the next rotation, that hit to them will rise to $29,000—an almost $30,000 reduction in total compensation from what they as a military couple would receive under the current system. That is significant. They are exactly the kinds of people the private sector wants to recruit but our military wants to retain, and I am not the only person who appreciates this fact.

When I was in Fort Wainwright, one dual military spouse said: Who I am married to should not affect my BAH entitlement. That summed it up in a pretty neat and tidy way.

Over this past week since I have been back here, I have heard from senior military leaders and senior enlisted advisers to those leaders, all of one voice. They are saying that this brings down the morale in the volunteer force. I will relay to my colleagues the comments from one of the commanders in Fort Wainwright when I was there last week. He had been sitting in the back of the room listening to all of the military spouses weigh in and voice their concerns and their anxiety about what was going on. He said to me: This is a clear reminder of how morale affects the overall mission. I have been on assignment. I have been deployed to Afghanistan. I have broken down doors. I have been on patrol looking for IEDs.

When you are on these missions, your head has to be 100 percent in the game. You can't be thinking about what is happening at home. You cannot be thinking about whether or not there are financial struggles that your spouse is dealing with. You cannot be distracted from where you are in the here and now. We are not just talking about ''quality of life'' issues; we are talking about ''matter of life and death'' issues.

He said: If my head is not 100 percent in the game, then somebody's life potentially is on the line.

It was a clear reminder to me of how morale affects the mission and how we need to ensure that our men and women whom we have tasked to take on the most difficult of tasks are able to focus on where they are right then. And making sure all is well at home is a responsibility we also have.

There has been a lot of discussion about the BAH over the years. Some of us think that it is in need of reform or that perhaps right-sizing the BAH will mean more money for readiness and modernization. I certainly get that argument. I may not agree with all of that, but I do know there are some very hard choices that have to be made in a difficult budget environment. I respect the work the chairman has done, along with the ranking member, in trying to deal with all of that. But I do feel very certain about one thing: Those who believe that BAH should be reformed need to make that case openly and directly and transparently to our military families. I think putting a game-changing provision like section 604 in the NDAA without that consultation misses the mark.

The changes we are considering in BAH would not be effective until 2018. We have some time here, and we can get this right. My amendment, which is a bipartisan amendment, simply says: Take a timeout. Let's take a step back.

To those who think the BAH is in need of reform, make the case to military families if you choose, but let's not rush this through. This is not what we should be doing.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD letters from the Military Officers Association of America as well as the Air Force Sergeants Association in support of my amendment.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MILITARY OFFICERS ASSOCIATION
OF AMERICA,
May 27, 2016.

Hon. LISA MURKOWSKI (R–AK),
Hart Senate Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR MURKOWSKI: I am writing to thank you for your continued strong support for our men and women in uniform and their families, as most recently demonstrated by your introduction of amendment #4222, which would remove § 604 from S. 2943, the Senate's FY17 defense policy legislation.

Section 604 aims to recoup more than $200 million annually from the Regular Military Compensation (RMA), earned by servicemembers through reductions to the Basic Allowance for Housing (BAH), a main component of RMA of which they are entitled to under law. These reductions would begin in January 2018 for new entrants into military service and after the next Permanent Change of Station (PCS), for those already serving.

The reductions to BAH, as called for in 604, undoes the diligent work done by Congress over the past 15 years to rectify the out of pocket housing costs long borne by servicemembers and clearly sends the wrong message to them and their families—that their service and sacrifice is not important.

At a time when we have asked servicemembers to contribute more to their retirement savings, more to their housing, and possibly more to their healthcare, this proposal is wrongly conceived, unfair, and would do harm to the retention of our currently serving men and women and their families.

The Military Officers Association of America (MOAA) strongly supports amendment #4222 to remove § 604 and urges other members of the Senate to support the amendment as well.

Thank you for your leadership and for your continued strong support for our men and women in uniform and their families.

Sincerely,

DANA T. ATKINS.

AIR FORCE SERGEANTS ASSOCIATION,
Suitland, MD, June 1, 2016.

Hon. LISA MURKOWSKI,
Hart Senate Office Building,
Washington DC.

DEAR SENATOR MURKOWSKI: on behalf of the 100,000 members of the Air Force Sergeants Association I want to thank you for introducing amendment #4222 to S. 2943. Removing §604 from the Senate's FY17 NDAA, as articulated in your amendment, is absolutely the right call!

To propose BAH reductions while servicemembers are already concurrently contributing more to their retirement and potentially to their healthcare clearly sends the wrong message. Keeping in mind that vast numbers of military families funnel their children into similar service, retention of those now serving in uniform as well as recruitment of future talent both stand to suffer.

AFSA strongly supports amendment #4222 to remove §604 from S.2943 and urges other members of the Senate to also support this amendment.

Respectfully,

ROBERT L. FRANK,
Chief Executive Officer.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I yield the floor to my colleague from North Dakota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I thank the senior Senator from Alaska. I appreciate that.

I rise today to speak in support of the NDAA, the National Defense Authorization Act, which we are currently working on. The NDAA is clearly one of the most important pieces of legislation we take up in Congress because it authorizes vital programs designed to keep our Nation secure and our people safe.

We have worked very hard to make sure the bill upholds the nuclear missions at our missile bases, as well as unmanned aerial systems—the UAS missions—that have emerged as a vigorous part of our Nation's defense.

I commend the chairman and the ranking member for their good work in bringing this bill to the floor. It is a massive undertaking. In particular, I thank them for their support on some important priorities.

This bill fully authorizes programs to sustain our strategic forces, including plans to upgrade the Minuteman III ICBM, the venerable B–52 bomber, and our nuclear cruise missiles. The bill also fully authorizes the Global Hawk program, which is proving its worth every day and demonstrates the value of unmanned aircraft in performing intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance missions.

The Appropriations Committee, on which I serve, approved the National Defense Appropriations Act last month, putting in place the funding to support our armed services. As soon as we pass the authorization bill that is now before the full Senate, I understand we will work to bring its companion bill, the appropriations bill, to the floor for a vote as well. Both are vital for our armed services.

Together, these two bills—the National Defense Authorization Act and the National Defense Appropriations Act—will provide our armed services with both the blueprint and the funding they need to defend our Nation and the American people.

As I have said, I have filed several amendments that I believe will strengthen the bill and our national security, and I wish to take a minute to talk about them now.

First, I have filed a measure that requires the Air Force to procure, in a timely manner, Black Hawk helicopters to replace the Vietnam-era Huey helicopters that currently provide security to our intercontinental ballistic missile fields. These fields are located near Minot Air Force Base in my home State of North Dakota, as well as at missile bases in Wyoming and the State of Montana.

The Air Force uses helicopters to provide security for missiles that are in transit, as well as to move security forces quickly to any missile field site that could come under any kind of threat.

I love the old Huey helicopters. They are great. I have flown in them for many years, on many occasions, and it is certainly an iconic aircraft and one that has served our Nation's military very well through the Vietnam era and through today. But the reality is that it is no longer able to do the job that we need done.

I spent some time with pilots at Minot Air Force Base earlier this year and heard about the challenges they face. For example, the front panel of the Huey sometimes will not light up. Remember, these are aircraft that were manufactured in 1969. The pilots flying these aircraft are a lot younger than the helicopters they are flying, but they do a remarkable job. The mechanics do an amazing job in keeping them going.

For example, sometimes the front panel of the Huey will not light up. When they are flying at night, they stick a portable LED light on the dash so they can see their gauges. Think about that. We have amazing young men and women in the military flying these helicopters that are much older than they are—helicopters from 1969. Some of the gauges don't have lights on them, so they put LED lights on as a makeshift way to see the gauges in the dark when they are flying to the missile fields performing their mission. If they hit some rough weather, guess what happens. The jostling knocks the LED lights off the control panel, and now they are in the dark. They can't even see their gauges.

Think about being out there flying helicopters on a military mission, and it is dark. You may be in rough weather, and you can't see your gauges. Obviously, that doesn't get the job done. That is not something that is acceptable for our men and women in uniform.

The Air Force acknowledges this, and they are working on getting an upgraded helicopter. To their credit, the Air Force wanted to move this as fast as possible, but under the plan DOD had approved, it would take 5 years before we would get new helicopters.

Think about the situation I just described. Here are these air men and women flying in this makeshift condition, in a situation where the Air Force has acknowledged that this equipment does not meet the mission requirements—does not meet the mission requirements. That is why we have to accelerate this timeline, and that is what this amendment does.

Specifically, my amendment instructs the Air Force to get Black Hawk helicopters on contract by 2018, which accelerates the Air Force's current procurement plan by approximately 2 years. It would enable them to acquire Black Hawk helicopters under the Army contract. The Army is already buying these helicopters. It has been fully bid. They have been doing it for some period of time. It would allow the Air Force to piggyback on it and buy the Black Hawk helicopters they need. It saves millions of dollars, I think somewhere between $80 and $120 million. This is commonsense stuff. I think it is a win all the way around.

This provision is coauthored by Senator JON TESTER, Democrat of Montana. Obviously, he is well aware of the problem, too, because they face the same difficulty across our border in Montana. It is cosponsored by the other members of the Senate's ICBM coalition. It is bipartisan. We have a number of Senators on board supporting it.

Also, it is a companion bill to the amendment that Senator TESTER and I included in the fiscal year 2017 Defense appropriations bill. We have already put $75 million in the Defense appropriations bill to start the acquisition. The dollars are there; this is the authorization that goes with the dollars. We worked very hard on this. We set it up the right way, and it is something we need to do.

The second amendment I introduced will help to meet the challenge of training enough pilots to fly RPAs, or remotely piloted aircraft—unmanned aircraft. I don't know that there is any mission in the Air Force or perhaps the whole DOD that is more in demand right now than RPAs, unmanned aircraft. All over the world, we are using this amazing tool—Global Hawk, Predator—and it is in tremendous demand right now. That also creates a tremendous demand for pilot training.

Chairman MCCAIN and Ranking Member REED included language in the base

bill that requires the Air Force to make the transition to using enlisted pilots to fly RPAs, so we would have both officers and enlisted pilots able to fly RPAs. It is needed because of the incredible demand for pilots, which results from the incredible demand for this mission.

I want to make sure that if the Air Force is going to make this transition, it can guarantee that pilots in the Air Guard, who use separate personnel systems and different training schedules, are able to receive training at a rate that is commensurate with their Active-Duty counterparts. Obviously, we rely heavily on the Air Guard, and they need to have the necessary access to training. This amendment directs that the Air Force is able to use contractor services to ensure that there is enough training capacity to train Air National Guard pilots to fly RPAs in order to keep pace with Active-Duty pilot training.

We know that the Air Force has had difficulty training RPA pilots fast enough to meet operational demands. One way to correct that deficiency is to use the private sector to augment the training the Air Force provides directly.

In North Dakota, General Atomics—the manufacturer of the Predator and the Reaper—is building a training academy to train pilots. It is at the Grand Forks Air Force Base. It is in a technology park on the Grand Forks Air Force Base. They are going to train pilots for their foreign military sales. So for aircraft that has been purchased by our military allies—France, England, Italy, Netherlands, I think maybe Australia—there are a litany of our allies who are now using RPAs, and General Atomics will conduct that training at Grand Forks Air Force Base. There is no reason our own Air Force can't leverage that incredible resource as well or resources like it at other locations. Clearly, it is something we need to help leverage our pilot training.

With that, I will wrap up. Again, I want to emphasize the importance of this and the National Defense Authorization Act. I thank both the chairman and the ranking member for their work.

I encourage all of my colleagues to join together in a bipartisan way and pass this important legislation for our men and women in uniform.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TILLIS). The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, to be recognized to speak in support of the McCain amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 4229

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, to Members of the body on both sides of the aisle, I appreciate the effort to produce a bipartisan national defense authorization bill. I think our committee did a good job in coming up with a bipartisan bill, but as a body and as a country we haven't done enough and this is a chance to rectify what I think is an incredibly big problem.

We are at war—at least I think we are. We have been at war for the last 15 years. I cannot tell you how hard it has been on the all-voluntary force. I was in the Air Force for 33 years. I retired last year. I had the pleasure of meeting a lot of men and women in uniform in Iraq and Afghanistan. I think I have been to Iraq and Afghanistan 37 times in the last decade. I have seen incredible sacrifice by those who serve our Nation to defend us against another 9/11 and what their families have gone through.

As a nation and a Congress, what have we done to those who have been fighting this war? We are on track to have the smallest Army since 1940. Sequestration—across-the-board budget cuts that have taken almost $1 trillion out of the defense budget—is insanity and nobody seems to give a damn about fixing it. None of us have to go and fly in planes that are about to fall out of the sky. None of us are commanders of troops and having to use duct tape to get through the day. None of us have to worry about going over and over and over to the war zone because the war is getting worse, not better.

It looks like all of us should listen to our commanders who have said with one voice that the readiness of the U.S. military is in an emergency situation. The ability to give the flying hours our pilots need can't be done because of budget constraints. It looks like we would want to listen to the Chief of Staff of the Army, Air Force, Navy, and the Commandant of the Marine Corps who are telling us that sequestration has taken a toll on the ability to defend this Nation.

We have had some patchwork solutions. We put some money back, but we are due to go back into sequestration next year. The amount of money we put back in the Ryan-Murray compromise was much appreciated, and Senator MCCAIN is trying to put an $18 billion infusion into the military to meet their unfunded needs that would plus-up the Army by 15,000 and would plus-up the Marine Corps and the National Guard and would give more money for operation and maintenance.

The problem that seems lost on this Congress is that training hours have to give way to operational needs in theater. Let me give one small example. There is a Marine Corps readiness rapid response force in Spain that is stationed in Spain to deal with Benghazi-type events throughout Africa. They have to fly—in case something went bad—thousands of miles. They have 12 aircraft, B–22s, and 2 teams. The Commandant of the Marine Corps is having to take six of these aircraft away from Spain to bring them back to the United States because we don't have enough airplanes to train the B–22 pilots. That means there is a hole in our ability to protect our citizens and diplomats in Africa.

I cannot tell you the damage that sequestration has done to our military, and we seem unmoved by all of this. I cannot believe that the body is not responding more aggressively to the needs of our military, given the threats we are facing. How much more information do we need from our commanders to believe this is an emergency?

I say to my Democratic colleagues, I know sequestration is hurting on the nondefense side, but all spending is not equal. I stand ready with you to find a way to buy back sequestration and pay for it by having some revenue come from closing loopholes and deductions like the supercommittee envisioned by using some revenue and some entitlement reform to buy back what is left on sequestration. I am not asking that you just spend money on defense and ignore the rest of the problems associated with sequestration.

I have sat done on two separate occasions with Members on the other side to try to find ways to buy back sequestration so we could actually achieve the savings, and we have been able to not do a whole lot. Ryan and Murray came up with a fix that provided some relief that expires at the end of the year.

The bottom line is this. The McCain amendment is making the argument that the $18 billion in this amendment has to be spent based on an emergency.

Here is the question: Is there an emergency when it comes to the operational needs of this country on the defense side? Have we put our troops in a spot where we are risking their lives and their ability to prosecute the war because we have gone too far with defense cuts? I think we have, but if you don't believe me, you should listen to our commanders and hopefully I can read some of their quotes.

With this $18 billion infusion, we are able to increase the size of the Army, and if you are in the Army, you could use a little help right about now. You have been busting your ass for the last 15 years, going back and forth, back and forth, and the way we reward your service is to decrease the size of the Army.

I just got back from Asia, and everybody in Asia is wondering: What the heck is America doing? We are going to have the smallest Navy since 1915. We are going to pivot to Asia with what? Under sequestration our ability to modernize the Navy has been lost. They don't have the money to build the new ships that we need to fight the wars of the future and contain a threatening China because they are in a war now. They are robbing Peter to pay Paul. It looks like we would want to help the Marines. If you are a marine, boy, have you been on the tip of the spear.

This amendment would allow us to have 3,000 more marines. What does that mean? It means we will have 3,000

more people to help prosecute the war and take a little burden off the Marine Corps, which has been absolutely worn out. Seventy percent of the F–18s in the Marine Corps have problems flying. We are cannibalizing planes to keep other planes in the air.

To those who say we need to reform the Pentagon, you are right. Not only do we need to, we have. Fifty percent of the Department of Defense budget is personnel costs. Last year we reformed retirement. At 20 years, you are not going to get half of your base pay. You will get 40 percent in the future. That will save money. We are going to allow a Thrift Savings Plan for those who want to contribute 5 percent of their pay and we will match 5 percent, but they can't get the money until they are 59 or 60. That will be money for the servicemembers, but it comes later.

We are going to ask our retirees to pay a little bit more for the military health care system because we haven't had a premium adjustment of any consequence since 1995. We are going to go to fixed-price contracts to deal with the abuse of cost-plus contracts to save money. We are trying to reduce the number of general officers because they have exploded.

We are doing a lot of things to make the Pentagon operate better, but at the end of the day, you need people to defend this country. When sequestration kicks back in, we are going to go from 475,000 to 420,000.

What I am asking for is a bipartisan effort to stop the bleeding, to take the request for the military that is unfunded and desperately needed and give them a little bit of hope. We need to let them know Congress is listening to their problem because we are not. We are ignoring the problems of our military because if we were really serious about helping them, we would pass this by a voice vote, but, no, we can't increase defense spending by $18 billion to increase the size of the Army, Marine Corps, and the National Guard, to give more flight time to our pilots, more money to maintain the equipment and increase the size of the National Guard, which has really suffered during the last 15 years, and to buy more airplanes. The bottom line is, we can't do all of that because we have to increase nondefense spending.

To my Democratic colleagues, if you don't think there is an emergency in the military, then you haven't been listening. To those Republicans who believe the appropriations bill has adequately funded the needs of the military, you haven't been listening. Well, I have been listening. Washington is broken in many ways. I enjoy being a Member of the Senate, and I respect my colleagues, even though we disagree, but this one I can't understand. I can't understand this. I can understand ideology, I can understand the differences between pro-life, pro-choice, guns, revenue, and taxes. I can understand conservatism, liberalism, libertarianism. I can understand that in a great country we have differences, but this I can't understand.

I can't understand why any of us would let this happen to our military. Whether you are a Libertarian, vegetarian, Republican, or Democrat, you need these men and women defending you so you can argue among yourselves. We can argue until the cows come home about how America should be, and it is a privilege to have this debate. While we are arguing among ourselves about how to make America great again or to become one, stronger together, or whatever damn phrase is out there, the people who are giving us the privilege to argue are being worn out and underfunded.

Let me tell you the consequence of this. At a time the enemy is growing in capability to attack this country, we are gutting our ability to defend this country. A perfect storm is brewing. We have an America in retreat and in decline all over the world. We have a Presidential contest that is absolutely crazy. The Republican nominee, when he talks about foreign policy, it is complete gibberish.

The Democratic nominee seems to be afraid to articulate how to change things. What is she going to do differently? Where is she on sequestration?

Secretary Clinton, do you think now is the time to spend more on our military because we are in an emergency situation? Tell me why I am wrong. Tell me why you don't believe all of the things said by those in leadership.

I am dumbfounded that this is hard given the state of readiness of our military. I am dumbfounded that we can't improve military readiness without increasing spending for food safety modernization. I am sure there is probably something legitimate there, but the Food Safety Modernization Act is not going to stop ISIL from coming here.

There is $1.9 billion for water infrastructure. I am sure it is legitimate, but all I can say is that whatever problems we have with water, they pale in comparison to the problems we have with terrorism.

Who are we as a body, who are we as a people if we can't see this being an emergency? If you are not listening and you have shut your mind and eyes to what is going on, then shame on you.

This is the low point to me; that we cannot as a body agree that our men and women in the military are in a bad spot and they need our help yesterday. So vote the way you are going to vote, but don't tell me that the Appropriations Committee, of which I am a member, has fixed the problem because we haven't. We did appropriate more money, and I appreciate it, but the $18 billion on this list is not addressed by the Appropriations Committee's effort to do more, and don't tell me this is not an emergency because I don't believe it. Don't hold the men and women hostage from getting the money they desperately need to defend us all because you want more money somewhere else.

Whatever differences we have, whatever hopes and dreams we have as individuals or collectively as Americans are at risk because the people we are fighting would kill every one of us if they could. They could care less if you are a Republican or Democrat, liberal or conservative. They want to hurt us, and they want to hurt us badly, and the only way to keep them from hurting us is for some of us to go over there in partnership with others over there to keep the fight from coming back over here.

It looks like all of us can agree on giving the people going over there the best chance they can to survive the fight, come back home and protect us all, but apparently we can't get there. Shame on us. Shame on us all.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—H.R. 2577

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at 7:30 p.m. this evening, the Chair lay before the Senate the House message accompanying H.R. 2577; that Senator MCCONNELL or his designee be recognized to make a motion that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House, agree to the request by the House for a conference, and authorize the Presiding Officer to appoint conferees; further, that Senator MCCONNELL or his designee be recognized to offer a motion to invoke cloture on the motion to go to conference and that once a cloture motion is offered, all time be yielded back and the Senate vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to go to conference; further, that if the motion to go to conference is agreed to, that Senator NELSON or his designee be recognized to offer a motion to instruct conferees and Senator SULLIVAN or his designee be recognized to offer a motion to instruct conferees and that the Senate vote with no intervening action or debate on the motions to instruct conferees in the order listed and that both motions require 60 affirmative votes for adoption; finally, that there be no further motions to instruct in order and that there be 4 minutes, equally divided, prior to each vote on the motions to instruct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I am grateful you will not make me repeat that.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRANSPORTATION, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2017

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Chair lays before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House insist upon its amendment to the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 2577) entitled ''An Act making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes,'' and ask a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

COMPOUND MOTION

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House, agree to the request by the House for a conference, and authorize the Presiding Officer to appoint conferees.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to disagree to the House amendment, agree to the request from the House for a conference, and authorize the Presiding Officer to appoint conferees with respect to H.R. 2577, an act making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes.

John McCain, John Cornyn, Marco Rubio, Deb Fischer, Rob Portman, Roger F. Wicker, Richard Burr, Joni Ernst, David Vitter, James M. Inhofe, Dean Heller, Pat Roberts, Lamar Alexander, Ron Johnson, Tom Cotton, Thom Tillis, Mitch McConnell.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum call be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Under the previous order, all time is yielded back.

CLOTURE MOTION

Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to disagree to the House amendment, agree to the request from the House for a conference, and authorize the Presiding Officer to appoint conferees with respect to H.R. 2577, an act making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes.

John McCain, John Cornyn, Marco Rubio, Deb Fischer, Rob Portman, Roger F. Wicker, Richard Burr, Joni Ernst, David Vitter, James M. Inhofe, Dean Heller, Pat Roberts, Lamar Alexander, Ron Johnson, Tom Cotton, Thom Tillis, Mitch McConnell.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the motion to disagree to the House amendment to the Senate amendment, agree to the request by the House for a conference, and authorize the Presiding Officer to appoint conferees with respect to H.R. 2577, an act making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) would have voted ''yea.''

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 93, nays 2, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 92 Leg.]

YEAS—93

Alexander	Crapo	King
Ayotte	Cruz	Kirk
Baldwin	Daines	Klobuchar
Barrasso	Donnelly	Lankford
Bennet	Durbin	Leahy
Blumenthal	Enzi	Manchin
Blunt	Ernst	Markey
Booker	Feinstein	McCain
Boozman	Fischer	McCaskill
Boxer	Flake	McConnell
Brown	Franken	Menendez
Burr	Gardner	Merkley
Cantwell	Gillibrand	Moran
Capito	Graham	Murkowski
Cardin	Grassley	Murphy
Carper	Hatch	Murray
Casey	Heinrich	Nelson
Cassidy	Heitkamp	Perdue
Coats	Heller	Peters
Cochran	Hirono	Portman
Collins	Hoeven	Reed
Coons	Inhofe	Risch
Corker	Isakson	Roberts
Cornyn	Johnson	Rounds
Cotton	Kaine	Rubio
Sasse	Shelby	Udall
Schatz	Stabenow	Vitter
Schumer	Sullivan	Warren
Scott	Tester	Whitehouse
Sessions	Thune	Wicker
Shaheen	Tillis	Wyden

NAYS—2

Lee	Paul

NOT VOTING—5

Mikulski	Sanders	Warner
Reid	Toomey	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 93, the nays are 2.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question occurs on agreeing to the compound motion to go to conference.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I have a motion to instruct conferees at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Florida [Mr. NELSON] moves that the managers on the part of the Senate at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 2577 be instructed to reject proposals that would rescind existing Ebola emergency funds provided by the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2015 (Public Law 113–235), and designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as such funds support Ebola preparedness and response efforts which are critical to preventing, detecting, and responding to potential future Ebola outbreaks, and to insist that the final conference report include $510,000,000 to reimburse Ebola accounts, as provided for in the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2015 (Public Law 113–235) and designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, for obligations incurred for Zika virus response, as such emergency Ebola funds support critical initiatives to prevent Ebola outbreaks, such as country operations and public health infrastructure in Liberia, Sierra Leone, and Guinea, public health research on infection control, including detection of person to person transmission of Ebola, and advanced research and development of new Ebola vaccines and therapeutics.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 4 minutes of debate, equally divided.

The Senator from Florida.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, this is a motion to instruct the conferees that whatever is decided in the conference to fund the Zika crisis, the money would not be taken out of the Ebola fund and that the money that has been borrowed from the Ebola fund would be replenished.

Remember that since the Ebola outbreak was contained 1 year ago, there have been seven more clusters of outbreaks since that time, and the CDC still employs 80 employees working on Ebola. With the last recent Ebola case

in Guinea, the CDC has had to vaccinate 1,700 people and then go out and do the infection control over there in West Africa in 50 health centers and make 20,000 connections to try to ensure that it does not spread, which of course is the source of how Ebola gets to the United States.

So this motion is simply to say: Let's not take the Zika crisis funds out of Ebola and replenish what has already been taken out.

Thank you, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, we did just vote to go to conference. I would like to see the conference be able to deal with this issue.

In the Ebola funds, there is still $1.2 billion left in the Ebola funds. There is still $1.2 billion left in the Ebola fund. This is $510 million that was to be used for things like reimbursing hospitals that would have an influx of Ebola patients in this country, which never happened, and other issues.

The administration has said they do not need this $510 million for Ebola. They clearly would like to use it for other purposes, and in fact have used $510 million for other purposes.

I would urge a ''no'' vote.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, do I have any time left?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Twenty-nine seconds.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I would say to my friend from Missouri simply that the administration does not say that they don't need this. As a matter of fact, in their $1.9 billion request, they have asked for the replenishment of this, and the statements that I just made were made by Dr. Frieden and Dr. Fauci as early as this morning.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, do I have any time left?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 1 minute.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, in the $1.9 billion request, they would not have asked for this money because they were asking for $1.9 billion of new money, some justified and some not.

I believe we worked hard to get a good start here. This can clearly be an open item in the conference, but I don't think it should be a directed item in the conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

Mr. DURBIN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) would have voted ''nay.''

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DAINES). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 46, nays 49, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 93 Leg.]

YEAS—46

Ayotte	Franken	Nelson
Baldwin	Gillibrand	Peters
Bennet	Heinrich	Portman
Blumenthal	Heitkamp	Reed
Booker	Hirono	Rubio
Boxer	Kaine	Schatz
Brown	King	Schumer
Burr	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Cantwell	Leahy	Stabenow
Cardin	Manchin	Tester
Carper	Markey	Udall
Casey	McCaskill	Warren
Coons	Menendez	Whitehouse
Donnelly	Merkley	Wyden
Durbin	Murphy	
Feinstein	Murray	

NAYS—49

Alexander	Fischer	Murkowski
Barrasso	Flake	Paul
Blunt	Gardner	Perdue
Boozman	Graham	Risch
Capito	Grassley	Roberts
Cassidy	Hatch	Rounds
Coats	Heller	Sasse
Cochran	Hoeven	Scott
Collins	Inhofe	Sessions
Corker	Isakson	Shelby
Cornyn	Johnson	Sullivan
Cotton	Kirk	Thune
Crapo	Lankford	Tillis
Cruz	Lee	Vitter
Daines	McCain	Wicker
Enzi	McConnell	
Ernst	Moran	

NOT VOTING—5

Mikulski	Sanders	Warner
Reid	Toomey	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for the adoption of this motion, the motion is rejected.

The Senator from Alaska.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I have a motion to instruct conferees at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Alaska [Mr. SULLIVAN] moves that the managers on the part of the Senate at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 2577 be instructed to insist upon the inclusion of the provisions contained in Senate amendment 4065 (relating to the reconstruction of certain bridges).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska is recognized.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, this instruction relates to an earlier amendment I had, No. 4065. It is a simple amendment that would allow States and communities throughout our Nation to expedite the permitting process and construction of their bridges that pose safety concerns for their citizens. This would only apply to bridges that are built in the same place—they are not expanding bridges—same size, and bridges they are replacing. It is essentially maintenance on bridges. If State environmental agencies determine that Federal permitting requirements should be waived, then they are allowed to do this to expedite the permitting of the bridge.

Let me explain why this is important. Right now in America, there are 61,000 structurally deficient bridges in need of repair. Yet when we try to repair these bridges, it takes 5 years to 6 years just to get the Federal permitting requirements. This amendment—these instructions would allow this process to move much more quickly. It will be important for the safety of our citizens, to put Americans back to work, and to grow our economy. It is a commonsense instruction.

I know my colleagues on both sides of the aisle are focused on permitting reform. This is something very simple that we can do that will benefit all of our States and all of our citizens.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I have laryngitis, which is the dream of my friends on the other side of the aisle, but I want to say that the Sullivan amendment is dangerous and it is unnecessary. It is the last thing we should do given the lessons we have learned in Flint, MI, because what the Sullivan amendment says is that you can be exempted from nine Federal health and safety laws when you rebuild the bridge. For example, it would allow the dumping of oil, toxic materials that could include lead, construction debris, and that all will go in the water—water we swim in, water we fish in, water we drink. After Flint, how could we do this?

This is not a problem. If you ask Senator KLOBUCHAR—I just talked to her—and Senator FRANKEN, they rebuilt their bridge in a year because there is already expedited language in all of the laws on which we worked together.

So please reject this. It is dangerous, it is unnecessary, and it certainly is unrelated to the underlying bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska has 15 seconds.

Mr. SULLIVAN. I yield to my colleague from Maine.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, in 15 seconds I yield to no one here in my commitment to the environment, but I also have a commitment to common sense. We are talking about bridges, not expanding—same size, same dimensions, and same location. If that were it, I would oppose this amendment; however, this amendment has a safety valve that the construction, reconstruction, or maintenance of the bridge must pass muster with the State-level permitting and environmental protection authority.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. KING. I understand. I think we should support it. Thank you.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, do I have any time remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 55 seconds.

Mrs. BOXER. Wow. In the beginning, God created.

I just want to say to my friend Senator KING, just ask the people of Flint,

MI, how happy they were that the State took over the health and safety rules. Their kids are suffering from lead poisoning. Sometimes you are talking about bridges that are 100 years old. They contain toxic materials. Again, this is not necessary. We haven't got a problem because we have taken care of expedited procedures. My arm was twisted on it in the FAST Act. So let's reject this because we want to protect the health and safety of the people we represent.

I urge a ''no'' vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) would have voted ''yea.''

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 56, nays 38, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 94 Leg.]

YEAS—56

Alexander	Ernst	Moran
Ayotte	Fischer	Murkowski
Barrasso	Flake	Paul
Blunt	Gardner	Perdue
Boozman	Grassley	Portman
Burr	Hatch	Risch
Capito	Heitkamp	Roberts
Cassidy	Heller	Rounds
Coats	Hoeven	Rubio
Cochran	Inhofe	Sasse
Collins	Isakson	Scott
Corker	Johnson	Sessions
Cornyn	King	Shelby
Cotton	Kirk	Sullivan
Crapo	Lankford	Thune
Cruz	Lee	Tillis
Daines	Manchin	Vitter
Donnelly	McCain	Wicker
Enzi	McConnell	

NAYS—38

Baldwin	Franken	Nelson
Bennet	Gillibrand	Peters
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Reed
Booker	Hirono	Schatz
Boxer	Kaine	Schumer
Brown	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Cantwell	Leahy	Stabenow
Cardin	Markey	Tester
Carper	McCaskill	Udall
Casey	Menendez	Warren
Coons	Merkley	Whitehouse
Durbin	Murphy	Wyden
Feinstein	Murray	

NOT VOTING—6

Graham	Reid	Toomey
Mikulski	Sanders	Warner

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for the adoption of this motion, the motion is rejected.

The Presiding Officer appointed Ms. COLLINS, Mr. KIRK, Mr. MCCONNELL, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. TESTER, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. REED, Mr. UDALL, Mr. SCHATZ, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. MIKULSKI, and Mr. LEAHY conferees on the part of the Senate.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2017—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk for S. 2943.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on Calendar No. 469, S. 2943, a bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

John McCain, John Cornyn, Orrin G. Hatch, Tom Cotton, Kelly Ayotte, Deb Fischer, Mike Rounds, Lindsey Graham, John Barrasso, Roger F. Wicker, Joni Ernst, Thom Tillis, Daniel Coats, Chuck Grassley, John Thune, Steve Daines, Mitch McConnell.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum call with respect to the cloture motion be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE NEVADA JUSTICE ASSOCIATION

Mr. REID. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize the 50th anniversary of the Nevada Justice Association. Since 1966, the Nevada Justice Association has been a fierce advocate for justice and worked to fulfill the ideals enshrined in our Nation's justice system.

The Nevada Justice Association is a nonprofit, professional organization of lawyers, united over their goal of improving the justice system. In addition to keeping members and other lawyers informed about Nevada's legal system, the Nevada Justice Association seeks ''to educate the public regarding their individual rights and responsibilities as citizens.'' The Nevada Justice Association also operates student chapters to help develop the next generation of lawyers and prepare them to defend Nevadans' access to justice in the future. In their effort to educate the public, the Nevada Justice Association's activities range from debunking legal myths to televising lecture series that explain important aspects of the law that people who do not have a legal background can understand. The Nevada Justice Association's outreach and education programs also encourage citizens to play an active role in the lawmaking process and participate in civil society.

For 50 years, the Nevada Justice Association has made tremendous advances in educating everyday Nevadans about their legal rights. Their commitment to ensuring that people have equal and lasting access to the justice system has helped Nevadans enjoy the protections our system of government has to offer. I commend the Nevada Justice Association for their hard work in educating the public on their rights and protecting people's access to justice.

BUDGET SCOREKEEPING REPORT

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I wish to submit to the Senate the budget scorekeeping report for June 2016. The report compares current law levels of spending and revenues with the amounts the Senate agreed to in the budget resolution for fiscal year 2016, the conference report to accompany S. Con. Res. 11, and the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2015, P.L. 114–74, BBA 15. This information is necessary for the Senate Budget Committee to determine whether budget points of order lie against pending legislation. It has been prepared by the Republican staff of the Senate Budget Committee and the Congressional Budget Office, CBO, pursuant to section 308(b) of the Congressional Budget Act.

This is the fifth report that I have made this calendar year. It is the second report since I filed the statutorily-required fiscal year 2017 enforceable budget limits on April 18, 2016, pursuant to section 102 of BBA 15, and the ninth report I have made since adoption of the fiscal year 2016 budget resolution on May 5, 2015. My last filing can be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on May 11, 2016. The information contained in this report is current through June 6, 2016.

Tables 1–7 of this report, which are prepared by my staff on the Budget Committee, remain unchanged from the May report.

In addition to the tables provided by the Senate Budget Committee Republican staff, I am submitting additional tables from CBO that I will use for enforcement of budget totals agreed to by the Congress.

Because legislation can still be enacted that would have an effect on fiscal year 2016, CBO provided a report for both fiscal year 2016 and fiscal year 2017. This information is used to enforce aggregate spending levels in budget resolutions under section 311 of the CBA. CBO's estimates show that current law levels of spending for fiscal year 2016 exceed the amounts in last year's budget resolution by $138.9 billion in budget authority and $103.6 billion in outlays. Revenues are $155.2 billion below the revenue floor for fiscal year 2016 set by the budget resolution. As well, Social Security outlays are at the levels assumed for fiscal year 2016, while Social Security revenues are $23 million below levels in the budget.

For fiscal year 2017, CBO estimates that current law levels are below the fiscal year 2017 enforcement filing's allowable budget authority and outlay aggregates by $974.3 billion and $592.4 billion, respectively. The allowable spending room will be reduced as appropriations bills for fiscal year 2017 are enacted. Revenues are at the level assumed for fiscal year 2017. Finally, Social Security outlays and revenues are at the levels assumed in the fiscal year 2017 enforcement filing.

CBO's report also provides information needed to enforce the Senate's pay-as-you-go rule. As part of the fiscal year 2017 enforcement filing, the Senate's pay-as-you-go scorecard was reset to zero, which remains its current balance. The Senate's pay-as-you-go rule is enforced by section 201 of S. Con. Res. 21, the fiscal year 2008 budget resolution.

New to this report are two additional tables that track the Senate's budget enforcement activities. The first table, Enforcement Report of Legislation Post-S. Con. Res. 11, fiscal year 2016 Congressional Budget Resolution, shows the 11 levels-based points of order that were raised after passage of the last budget resolution but before my April 18 filing. The largest budgetary violation during that period was the nonappropriations portion of H.R. 2029, the Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2016. The final table of this filing, Enforcement Report of Legislation Post-Bipartisan Budget Act of 2015 Enforcement Filing, shows the three points of order that have been raised since my April 18 enforcement filing. Two of those three points of order were raised against emergency designations in an appropriations bill. The first was raised against the emergency designation in Senator BLUNT's amendment No. 3900, that provided $1.1 billion to address the Zika virus. This point of order was waived with 70 votes. The second was raised against the emergency designation in Senator MCCAIN's amendment No. 4039, that would increase spending by $7.7 billion for the Veterans Choice Program. This point of order was waived with 84 votes.

All years in the accompanying tables are fiscal years.

I ask unanimous consent that the accompanying tables be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 1.—SENATE AUTHORIZING COMMITTEES—ENACTED DIRECT SPENDING ABOVE (+) OR BELOW (−) BUDGET RESOLUTIONS

[In millions of dollars]

	2016	2017	2017–2021	2017–2026
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry				
Budget Authority	0	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0	0
Armed Services				
Budget Authority	−66	0	0	0
Outlays	−50	0	0	0
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs				
Budget Authority	0	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0	0
Commerce, Science, and Transportation				
Budget Authority	130	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0	0
Energy and Natural Resources				
Budget Authority	0	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0	0
Environment and Public Works				
Budget Authority	2,880	0	0	0
Outlays	252	0	0	0
Finance				
Budget Authority	365	0	0	0
Outlays	365	0	0	0
Foreign Relations				
Budget Authority	0	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0	0
Homeland Security and Government Affairs				
Budget Authority	0	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0	0
Judiciary				
Budget Authority	−3,358	0	0	0
Outlays	1,713	0	0	0
Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions				
Budget Authority	0	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0	0
Rules and Administration				
Budget Authority	0	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0	0
Intelligence				
Budget Authority	0	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0	0
Veterans' Affairs				
Budget Authority	−2	0	0	0
Outlays	388	0	0	0
Indian Affairs				
Budget Authority	0	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0	0
Small Business				
Budget Authority	0	0	0	0
Outlays	1	0	0	0
Total				
Budget Authority	−51	0	0	0
Outlays	2,669	0	0	0

TABLE 2.—SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE—ENACTED REGULAR DISCRETIONARY APPROPRIATIONS [1]

[Budget authority, in millions of dollars]

	2016	
	Security [2]	Nonsecurity [2]
Statutory Discretionary Limits	548,091	518,491
Amount Provided by Senate Appropriations Subcommittee		
Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies	0	21,750
Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies	5,101	50,621
Defense	514,000	136
Energy and Water Development	18,860	18,325
Financial Services and General Government	44	23,191
Homeland Security	1,705	39,250
Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies	0	32,159
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education and Related Agencies	0	162,127
Legislative Branch	0	4,363
Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies	8,171	71,698
State Foreign Operations, and Related Programs	0	37,780
Transportation and Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies	210	57,091
Current Level Total	548,091	518,491
Total Enacted Above (+) or Below (−) Statutory Limits	0	0

[1] This table excludes spending pursuant to adjustments to the discretionary spending limits. These adjustments are allowed for certain purposes in section 251(b)(2) of BBEDCA.

[2] Security spending is defined as spending in the National Defense budget function (050) and nonsecurity spending is defined as all other spending.

TABLE 3.—SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE—ENACTED REGULAR DISCRETIONARY APPROPRIATIONS [1]

[Budget authority, in millions of dollars]

	2017	
	Security [2]	Nonsecurity [2]
Statutory Discretionary Limits	551,068	518,531
Amount Provided by Senate Appropriations Subcommittee		
Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies	0	9
Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies	0	0
Defense	45	0
Energy and Water Development	0	0
Financial Services and General Government	0	0
Homeland Security	0	9
Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies	0	0
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education and Related Agencies	0	24,690
Legislative Branch	0	0
Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies	0	60,634
State Foreign Operations, and Related Programs	0	0
Transportation and Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies	0	4,400
Current Level Total	45	89,742
Total Enacted Above (+) or Below (−) Statutory Limits	−551,023	−428,789

[1] This table excludes spending pursuant to adjustments to the discretionary spending limits. These adjustments are allowed for certain purposes in section 251(b)(2) of BBEDCA.

[2] Security spending is defined as spending in the National Defense budget function (050) and nonsecurity spending is defined as all other spending.

TABLE 4.—SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE—ENACTED OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS/GLOBAL WAR ON TERRORISM DISCRETIONARY APPROPRIATIONS

[In millions of dollars]

	2016	
	BA	OT
OCO/GWOT Allocation [1]	73,693	32,079
Amount Provided by Senate Appropriations Subcommittee		
Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies	0	0
Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies	0	0
Defense	58,638	27,354
Energy and Water Development	0	0
Financial Services and General Government	0	0
Homeland Security	160	128
Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies	0	0
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education and Related Agencies	0	0
Legislative Branch	0	0
Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies	0	0
State Foreign Operations, and Related Programs	14,895	4,597
Transportation and Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies	0	0
Current Level Total	73,693	32,079
Total OCO/GWOT Spending vs. Budget Resolution	0	0

BA = Budget Authority; OT = Outlays

[1] This allocation may be adjusted by the Chairman of the Budget Committee to account for new information, pursuant to section 3102 of S. Con. Res. 11, the Concurrent Resolution of the Budget for Fiscal Year 2016.

TABLE 5.—SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE—ENACTED CHANGES IN MANDATORY SPENDING PROGRAMS (CHIMPS)

[Budget authority, millions of dollars]

	2016
CHIMPS Limit for Fiscal Year 2016	19,100
Senate Appropriations Subcommittees	
Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies	600
Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies	9,458
Defense	0
Energy and Water Development	0
Financial Services and General Government	725
Homeland Security	176
Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies	28
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education and Related Agencies	6,799
Legislative Branch	0
Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies	0
State Foreign Operations, and Related Programs	0
Transportation and Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies	0
Current Level Total	17,786
Total CHIMPS Above (+) or Below (−) Budget Resolution	−1,314

TABLE 6.—SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE—ENACTED CHANGES IN MANDATORY SPENDING PROGRAM (CHIMP) TO THE CRIME VICTIMS FUND

[Budget authority, millions of dollars]

	2016
Crime Victims Fund (CVF) CHIMP Limit for Fiscal Year 2016	10,800
Senate Appropriations Subcommittees	
Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies	0
Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies	9,000
Defense	0
Energy and Water Development	0
Financial Services and General Government	0
Homeland Security	0
Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies	0
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education and Related Agencies	0
Legislative Branch	0
Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies	0
State Foreign Operations, and Related Programs	0
Transportation and Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies	0
Current Level Total	9,000
Total CVF CHIMP Above (+) or Below (−) Budget Resolution	−1,800

TABLE 6.—SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE—ENACTED CHANGES IN MANDATORY SPENDING PROGRAM (CHIMP) TO THE CRIME VICTIMS FUND—Continued

[Budget authority, millions of dollars]

	2016
Transportation and Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies	0
Current Level Total	9,000
Total CVF CHIMP Above (+) or Below (−) Budget Resolution	−1,800

TABLE 7.—SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE—ENACTED CHANGES IN MANDATORY SPENDING PROGRAMS (CHIMPS)

[Budget authority, millions of dollars]

	2017
CHIMPS Limit for Fiscal Year 2017	19,100
Senate Appropriations Subcommittees	
Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies	0
Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies	0
Defense	0
Energy and Water Development	0
Financial Services and General Government	0
Homeland Security	0
Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies	0
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education and Related Agencies	0
Legislative Branch	0
Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies	0
State Foreign Operations, and Related Programs	0
Transportation and Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies	0
Current Level Total	0
Total CHIMPS Above (+) or Below (−) Budget Resolution	−19,100

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, June 8, 2016.

Hon. MIKE ENZI,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The enclosed report shows the effects of Congressional action on the fiscal year 2016 budget and is current through June 6, 2016. This report is submitted under section 308(b) and in aid of section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended.

The estimates of budget authority, outlays, and revenues are consistent with the technical and economic assumptions of S. Con. Res. 11, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2016.

Since our last letter dated May 11, 2016, the Congress has not cleared any legislation for the President's signature that affects budget authority, outlays, or revenues.

Sincerely,

KEITH HALL,
Director.

Enclosure.

TABLE 1.—SENATE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT FOR SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016, AS OF JUNE 6, 2016

[In billions of dollars]

	Budget Resolution	Current Level [a]	Current Level Over/Under (−) Resolution
On-Budget			
Budget Authority	3,069.8	3,208.7	138.9
Outlays	3,091.2	3,194.9	103.6
Revenues	2,676.0	2,520.7	−155.2
Off-Budget			
Social Security Outlays [b]	777.1	777.1	0.0
Social Security Revenues	794.0	794.0	0.0

Source: Congressional Budget Office.

[a] Excludes emergency funding that was not designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

[b] Excludes administrative expenses paid from the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund of the Social Security Administration, which are off-budget, but are appropriated annually.

TABLE 2.—SUPPORTING DETAIL FOR THE SENATE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT FOR ON-BUDGET SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016, AS OF JUNE 6, 2016

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget Authority	Outlays	Revenues
Previously Enacted [a]			
Revenues	n.a.	n.a.	2,676,733
Permanents and other spending legislation	1,968,496	1,902,345	n.a.
Appropriation legislation	0	500,825	n.a.
Offsetting receipts	−784,820	−784,879	n.a.
Total, Previously Enacted	1,183,676	1,618,291	2,676,733
Enacted Legislation:			
An act to extend the authorization to carry out the replacement of the existing medical center of the Department of Veterans Affairs in Denver, Colorado, to authorize transfers of amounts to carry out the replacement of such medical center, and for other purposes (P.L. 114–25)	0	20	0
Defending Public Safety Employees' Retirement Act & Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015 (P.L. 114–26)	0	0	5
Trade Preferences Extension Act of 2015 (P.L. 114–27)	445	175	−766
Steve Gleason Act of 2015 (P.L. 114–40)	5	5	0
Surface Transportation and Veterans Health Care Choice Improvement Act of 2015 (P.L. 114–41) [b]	0	0	99
Continuing Appropriations Act, 2016 (P.L. 114–53)	700	775	0
Airport and Airway Extension Act of 2015 (P.L. 114–55)	130	0	0
Department of Veterans Affairs Expiring Authorities Act of 2015 (P.L. 114–58)	−2	368	0
Protecting Affordable Coverage for Employees Act (P.L. 114–60)	0	0	40
Bipartisan Budget Act of 2015 (P.L. 114–74)	3,424	4,870	269
Recovery Improvements for Small Entities After Disaster Act of 2015 (P.L. 114–88)	0	1	0
National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (P.L. 114–92)	−66	−50	0
Fixing America's Surface Transportation Act (P.L. 114–94)	2,880	252	471
Federal Perkins Loan Program Extension Act of 2015 (P.L. 114–105)	269	269	0
Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2016 (P.L. 114–113) [b]	2,008,016	1,563,177	−156,107
Patient Access and Medicare Protection Act (P.L. 114–115)	32	32	0
Trade Facilitation and Trade Enforcement Act of 2015 (P.L. 114–125)	20	20	−7
Total, Enacted Legislation	2,015,853	1,569,914	−155,996
Entitlements and Mandatories:			
Budget resolution estimates of appropriated entitlements and other mandatory programs	9,170	6,674	0
Total Current Level [c]	3,208,699	3,194,879	2,520,737
Total Senate Resolution [d]	3,069,829	3,091,246	2,675,967
Current Level Over Senate Resolution	138,870	103,633	n.a.
Current Level Under Senate Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	155,230

Source: Congressional Budget Office.

Notes: n.a. = not applicable, P.L. = Public Law.

[a] Includes the following acts that affect budget authority, outlays, or revenues, and were cleared by the Congress during this session, but before the adoption of S. Con. Res. 11, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2016: the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program Reauthorization Act of 2014 (P.L. 114–1); the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2015 (P.L. 114–4), and the Medicare Access and CHIP Reauthorization Act of 2015 (P.L. 114–10).

[b] Emergency funding that was not designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 shall not count for certain budgetary enforcement purposes. These amounts, which are not included in the current level totals, are are follows:

	Budget Authority	Outlays	Revenues
Surface Transportation and Veterans Health Care Choice Improvement Act of 2015 (P.L. 114–41)	0	917	0
Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2016 (P.L. 114–113)	−2	0	0

	Budget Authority	Outlays	Revenues
Total	−2	917	0

[c] For purposes of enforcing section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act in the Senate, the resolution, as approved by the Senate, does not include budget authority, outlays, or revenues for off-budget amounts. As a result, current level does not include these items.

[d] Periodically, the Senate Committee on the Budget revises the budgetary levels in S. Con. Res. 11, pursuant to various provisions of the resolution. The Initial Senate Resolution total below excludes $6,872 million in budget authority and $344 million in outlays assumed in S. Con. Res. 11 for disaster-related spending. The Revised Senate Resolution total below includes amounts for disaster-related spending:

	Budget Authority	Outlays	Revenues
Initial Senate Resolution	3,032,343	3,091,098	2,676,733
Revisions:			
Pursuant to section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and section 4311 of S. Con. Res. 11	445	175	−766
Pursuant to section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and S. Con. Res. 11	700	700	0
Pursuant to section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and S. Con. Res. 11	0	1	0
Pursuant to section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and section 4313 of S. Con. Res. 11	269	269	0
Pursuant to section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and section 3404 of S. Con. Res. 11	36,072	−997	0
Revised Senate Resolution	3,069,829	3,091,246	2,675,967

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, June 8, 2016.

Hon. MIKE ENZI,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The enclosed report shows the effects of Congressional action on the fiscal year 2017 budget and is current through June 6, 2016, This report is submitted under section 308(b) and in aid of section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended.

The estimates of budget authority, outlays, and revenues are consistent with the allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels printed in the Congressional Record on April 18, 2016, pursuant to section 102 of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2015 (Public Law 114–74).

Since our last letter dated May 11, 2016, the Congress has not cleared any legislation for the President's signature that affects budget authority, outlays, or revenues.

Sincerely,

KEITH HALL,
Director.

Enclosure.

TABLE 1.—SENATE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT FOR SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2017, AS OF JUNE 6, 2016

[In billions of dollars]

	Budget Resolution	Current Level	Current Level Over/Under (−) Resolution
ON-BUDGET			
Budget Authority	3,212.4	2,238.0	−974.3
Outlays	3,219.2	2,626.8	−592.4
Revenues	2,682.0	2,682.0	0.0
OFF-BUDGET			
Social Security Outlays [a]	805.4	805.4	0.0
Social Security Revenues	826.1	826.1	0.0

Source: Congressional Budget Office.

[a] Excludes administrative expenses paid from the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund of the Social Security Administration, which are off-budget, but are appropriated annually.

TABLE 2.—SUPPORTING DETAIL FOR THE SENATE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT FOR ON-BUDGET SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2017, AS OF JUNE 6, 2016

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget Authority	Outlays	Revenues
Previously Enacted:			
Revenues	n.a.	n.a.	2,681,976
Permanents and other spending legislation	2,054,886	1,960,659	n.a.
Appropriation legislation	0	504,803	n.a.
Offsetting receipts	−834,250	−834,301	n.a.
Total, Previously Enacted	1,220,636	1,631,161	2,681,976
Entitlements and Mandatories:			
Budget resolution estimates of appropriated entitlements and other mandatory programs	1,017,381	995,610	0
Total Current Level [a]	2,238,017	2,626,771	2,681,976
Total Senate Resolution	3,212,350	3,219,191	2,681,976
Current Level Over Senate Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Current Level Under Senate Resolution	974,333	592,420	n.a.
Memorandum:			
Revenues, 2017–2026:			
Senate Current Level	n.a.	n.a.	32,350,752
Senate Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	32,350,752
Current Level Over Senate Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Current Level Under Senate Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.

Source: Congressional Budget Office.

Notes: n.a. = not applicable; P.L. = Public Law.

[a] For purposes of enforcing section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act in the Senate, the budget resolution does not include budget authority, outlays, or revenues for off-budget amounts. As a result, current level does not include these items.

TABLE 3.—SUMMARY OF THE SENATE PAY-AS-YOU-GO SCORECARD FOR THE 114TH CONGRESS, AS OF JUNE 6, 2016

[In millions of dollars]

	2016–2021	2016–2026
Beginning Balance [a]	0	0
Enacted Legislation. [b c d]		
Breast Cancer Awareness Commemorative Coin Act (P.L. 114–148) [c]	0	0
Protect and Preserve International Cultural Property Act (P.L. 114–151)	*	*
Defend Trade Secrets Act of 2016 (P.L. 114–153)	*	*
Transnational Drug Trafficking Act of 2015 (P.L. 114–154)	*	*

TABLE 3.—SUMMARY OF THE SENATE PAY-AS-YOU-GO SCORECARD FOR THE 114TH CONGRESS, AS OF JUNE 6, 2016—Continued

[In millions of dollars]

	2016–2021	2016–2026
A bill to direct the Administrator of General Services, on behalf of the Archivist of the United States, to convey certain Federal property located in the State of Alaska to the Municipality of Anchorage, Alaska (P.L. 114–161)	*	*
Disapproving the rule submitted by the Department of Labor relating to the definition of the term "Fiduciary" (H.J. Res. 88)	*	*

TABLE 3.—SUMMARY OF THE SENATE PAY-AS-YOU-GO SCORECARD FOR THE 114TH CONGRESS, AS OF JUNE 6, 2016—Continued

[In millions of dollars]

	2016–2021	2016–2026
Current Balance	0	0
Memorandum:		
	2016–2021	2016–2026
Changes to Revenues	0	0
Changes to Outlays	0	0

Source: Congressional Budget Office.

Notes: n.e. = not able to estimate; P.L. = Public Law. * = between −$500,000 and $500,000.

[a] Pursuant to the statement printed in the Congressional Record on April 18, 2016, the Senate Pay-As-You-Go Scorecard was reset to zero.

[b] The amounts shown represent the estimated impact of the public laws on the deficit. Negative numbers indicate an increase in the deficit; positive numbers indicate a decrease in the deficit.

[c] Excludes off-budget amounts.
[d] Excludes amounts designated as emergency requirements.

[e] P.L. 114–148 will cause a decrease in spending of $7 million in 2018 and an increase in spending of $7 million in 2020 for a net impact of zero over the six-year and eleven-year periods.

ENFORCEMENT REPORT OF LEGISLATION POST-S. CON. RES. 11, FY 2016 CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET RESOLUTION

Vote	Date	Measure	Violation	Motion to Waive [e]	Result
276	October 7, 2015	Conference Report to Accompany H.R. 1735, the National Defense Authorization Act of 2016 (Sen. McCain, R–AZ).	Sec 3101 of S. Con. Res. 11—Long-Term Deficit Increased by More Than $5 Billion.	Senator McCain (R–AZ)	71–26, Waived
293	October 30, 2015	House Amendment to the Senate Amendment to H.R. 1314, the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2015.	Sec. 311(a)(3)—Social Security Levels Violation [a]	Senator Cornyn (R–TX)	64–35, Waived
313	December 3, 2015	S. Amdt. 2883 (Sen Brown, D–OH) to S. Amdt 2874 to H.R. 3762, the Restoring Americans' Healthcare Freedom Reconciliation Act of 2015.	Sec 302(f)—Committee Allocation Violation [a]	Senator Brown (D–OH)	45–55, Not Waived
315	December 3, 2015	S. Amdt. 2893 (Sen Casey, D–PA) to S. Amdt 2874 to H.R. 3762, the Restoring Americans' Healthcare Freedom Reconciliation Act of 2015.	Sec 302(f)—Committee Allocation Violation [a]	Senator Casey (D–PA)	46–54, Not Waived
317	December 3, 2015	S. Amdt. 2892 (Sen. Shaheen, D–NH) to S. Amdt 2874 to H.R. 3762, the Restoring Americans' Healthcare Freedom Reconciliation Act of 2015.	Sec 302(f)—Committee Allocation Violation [a]	Senator Shaheen (D–NH)	47–52, Not Waived
322	December 3, 2015	S. Amdt. 2907 (Sen. Bennet, D–CO) to S. Amdt 2874 to H.R. 3762, the Restoring Americans' Healthcare Freedom Reconciliation Act of 2015.	Sec 302(f)—Committee Allocation Violation [a]	Senator Bennet (D–CO)	47–52, Not Waived
327	December 3, 2015	S. Amdt. 2919 (Sen. Baldwin, D–WI) to S. Amdt 2874 to H.R. 3762, the Restoring Americans' Healthcare Freedom Reconciliation Act of 2015.	Sec 302(f)—Committee Allocation Violation [a]	Senator Baldwin (D–WI)	45–54, Not Waived
328	December 3, 2015	S. Amdt. 2918 (Sen. Murphy, D–CT) to S. Amdt 2874 to H.R. 3762, the Restoring Americans' Healthcare Freedom Reconciliation Act of 2015.	Sec 302(f)—Committee Allocation Violation [a]	Senator Murphy (D–CT)	46–53, Not Waived
338	December 18, 2015	H.R. 2029, Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2016	311(a)(2)(B)—Revenues reduced below levels assumed in the budget resolution [c].	Senator Wyden (D–OR)	73–25, Waived
29	March 2, 2016	S. Amdt. 3395 (Sen. Wyden, D–OR) to S. Amdt 3378 to S. 524, the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act of 2016.	Sec 302(f)—Committee Allocation Violation [a]	Senator Wyden (D–OR)	46–50, Not Waived
30	March 2, 2016	S. Amdt. 3345 (Sen. Shaheen, D–NH) to S. Amdt 3378 to S. 524, the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act of 2016.	311(a)(2)—Topline Spending Aggregate Violation [d].	Senator Shaheen (D–NH)	48–47, Not Waived

[a] Point estimates were unavailable at the time of consideration, however, points of order were able to be raised base on estimated magnitude, timing, or sign (positive or negative) of spending.
[b] CBO estimated that this amendment would increase direct spending by $20 billion over ten years.
[c] CBO and JCT estimated that this bill would decrease revenues by approximately $520 billion over ten years.
[d] CBO estimated that this amendment would increase spending by $600 million over ten years.
[e] Unless otherwise noted, the motion to waive was offered pursuant to section 904 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

ENFORCEMENT REPORT OF LEGISLATION POST-BIPARTISAN BUDGET ACT OF 2015 ENFORCEMENT FILING

Vote	Date	Measure	Violation	Motion to Waive [d]	Result
53	April 19, 2016	S. Amdt. 3787 (Sen. Paul, R–KY) to S. Amdt. 2953 to S. 2012 (Energy Policy Modernization Act of 2015).	311(a)(2)(B)—Revenues reduced below levels assumed in the budget resolution [a].	Sen. Paul (R–KY)	33–64, Not Waived
76	May 19, 2016	S. Amdt. 3900 (Sen. Blunt, R–MO) to S. Amdt 3896 to H.R. 2577 (Transportation, Housing and Urban Development Appropriations Act of 2017).	314(e)—Inclusion of emergency designations pursuant to Sec. 251 of BBEDCA [b].	Sen. Collins (R–ME)	70–28, Waived
79	May 19, 2016	S. Amdt. 4039 (Sen. McCain, R–AZ) to S. Amdt 3896 to H.R. 2577 (Transportation, Housing and Urban Development Appropriations Act of 2017).	314(e)—Inclusion of emergency designations pursuant to Sec. 251 of BBEDCA [c].	Sen. McCain (R–AZ)	84–14, Waived

[a] At the time of consideration, a point estimate was unavailable for the Paul amendment. However, it was estimated that it would decrease revenues below the levels assumed in the budget resolution.
[b] This amendment designated $1.1 billion in outlays as being for emergency purposes. This funding, which was not offset, would be used to combat the Zika virus.
[c] This amendment designated $7.7 billion in outlays as being for emergency purposes. This funding, which was not offset, would be used to extend the Veterans Choice Program.
[d] Unless otherwise noted, the motion to waive was offered pursuant to section 904 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

BARBARA BUSH FOUNDATION FOR FAMILY LITERACY

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a copy of my remarks from earlier today at the Barbara Bush Foundation for Family Literacy's Conversation on the Future of Adult Literacy.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BARBARA BUSH FOUNDATION FOR FAMILY LITERACY

Mr. ALEXANDER. I'm glad to be invited to join the conversation on adult literacy and to do as my late friend Alex Haley used to say, ''Find the good and praise it,'' especially about Barbara Bush. Tomorrow, one of the speakers you're going to hear, Jon Meacham, just finished his book, a biography of George H. W. Bush, and had the extraordinary opportunity to go through the personal diaries of Barbara and President Bush going back to the 1960s. I don't know any other biographer who's had that kind of access to that much material. The name of the book is ''Destiny and Power.'' I have a friend in Nashville who says that a better name for the book would be ''The Last Gentleman.'' I think an even better name for the book would be ''The Last Gentleman and His Lady,'' and perhaps the best name for the book would be ''The Last Gentleman and His Very Independent Lady'' because as we all know Barbara Bush was and is a very independent lady. I know that from experience.

In 1991, it was a sunny day on the South Lawn of the White House, and President Bush was walking out to announce his program to help give scholarships to low-income children so they could choose schools. It was called the ''GI Bill for Kids'' and President and Mrs. Bush were walking along toward the event, and I was with them and Barbara looked at the president and said, ''You've got on the wrong pants.'' He had one suit coat on and different pants on. She insisted that he turn around and go back into the White House and change his clothes before making his announcement.

On another occasion, the President and Mrs. Bush invited Honey and me to go with them one evening to Ford's Theatre. When we arrived there in the presidential limousine, the Secret Service opened the door and the President got out first and Barbara said, ''I'll get the door, George.''

On another occasion, I was sitting with them and I forget what it was, he may have been vice president then, but he was called on to speak unexpectedly and he leaned over to Barbara and said, ''What should I speak about?'' and she said, ''About five minutes, George.'' So she is a very independent lady.

Before we go much further in this discussion about adult literacy, let's recognize that today is our lady's 91st birthday.

As was mentioned, I was education secretary in 1991 when the National Literacy Act was enacted. Let's use Barbara Bush's own words to describe the event—you'll find them in her memoir. She wrote, ''I must say, I got more credit than I deserved.'' I don't agree with that, but, she continued, ''I heard that George was going to give the pen to me, but before he could, Senator Simon spoke up and said, 'That pen ought to go to Barbara.' I donated it to the George Bush Presidential Library Center. In the end, however, it's not pens and pictures that count; it's the National Literacy Act that really counts. It was the first piece of legislation—and, to date, the only one—ever enacted specifically for literacy with the goal of ensuring that every American adult acquires the basic literacy skills necessary to achieve the greatest possible satisfaction professionally and personally. But even more than that, the act seeks to strengthen our nation by giving us more productive workers and informed citizens.'' That was Barbara Bush's memoir.

Three years before that, in 1988, the year President George H. W. Bush was elected, the Saturday Evening Post did a cover story on Barbara and her passion for literacy. The writer told a story of JT Pace, the 63-year-old son of a former sharecropper who had just learned to read and was invited to read the Preamble to the Constitution on a televised program celebrating the bicentennial of the Constitution as well as the cause of literacy. When Mr. Pace arrived in St. Louis for the event, he discovered there were a few words in the Preamble that he couldn't read. Right when he decided he couldn't participate, Pace was introduced to Barbara Bush. She put him at ease and asked if they might read the Preamble together. The reporter writes: ''That evening, they stood together on the podium and slowly began to read the Preamble. JT mumbled some of the difficult words; gradually Barbara Bush's voice subsided as JT gained confidence and finished his reading in a strong voice, his eyes glistening with tears.'' That was the story from the Saturday Evening Post.

How important it is for the future of our country that adult Americans will be able to read our Constitution and understand that we are united by our principles and what those principles are—and not by our ethnicity. It's an important reminder to think about the fact that if you move to say, Japan, you can't become Japanese, really, but if you move to America and embrace our principles, you are an American.

In 1989, President George H. W. Bush did an extraordinary thing. He convened a meeting of all the governors in Charlottesville. The governors do not get together for a single purpose like that very much in history. They established voluntary, I underline voluntary, national goals. In 1991, by then I had been invited to be education secretary, the president announced America 2000, to move the nation voluntarily toward those goals state by state, community by community. America 2000 had six goals, and one of those was to increase adult literacy. We said then that a ''Nation at Risk'' must become a ''Nation of Students.'' In 1991, Congress passed the National Literacy Act. That act increased authorization of literacy programs, established a National Institute for Literacy, authorized state literacy resource centers, created national workforce demonstration projects, literacy programs for some incarcerated individuals, and required ''Gateway Grants'' to public housing authorities.

Today, we continue to focus on literacy. The National Literacy Act was most recently reauthorized, as we say in Congress, in 2014 as a part of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act. Then, in December, as was mentioned, we passed a law to fix No Child Left Behind. That included several references to encourage literacy, by innovative, competitive literacy programs, allowing states and schools to use federal money in all their formula programs on improving the literacy skills of students and defining reading and literacy activities as part of a well-rounded education.

We are all very fortunate that Barbara Bush is still as active in her pursuit of literacy for all as she used to be, and we honor her lifetime of work by gathering here for this conversation today. Last year, on her 90th birthday, she announced the $7 million Barbara Bush Adult Literacy XPRIZE. This global competition challenges teams from around the world to develop an app that will help people learn to read by just using their smartphone. There are currently 109 teams from 15 countries working on this. Barbara has always been able to see what's important, what endures—while also looking forward to the future with optimism and wit. It reminds me of the story that Jon Meacham tells in the biography of President H. W. Bush that I had mentioned earlier.

He writes of a ''generational controversy'' that Barbara Bush endured in May 1990. ''Generational controversy'' are Meacham's words; he always comes up with good, big words. It was during the visit by Mikhail Gorbachev and his wife to the White House to see the President and Mrs. Bush. According to Meacham, ''Mrs. Bush was invited by Wellesley College to speak at graduation and receive an honorary degree; the First Lady was being criticized by Wellesley's young women, as President Bush put into his diary 'because she hasn't made it on her own—she's where she is because she's her husband's wife. What's wrong with the fact that she's a good mother, a good wife, great volunteer, great leader for literacy and other fine causes? Nothing. But to listen to these elitist kids there is.' Mrs. Bush invited [Mrs.] Gorbachev along with her to Wellesley. There, the American First Lady confronted the issues of work versus family and the role of women head-on, delivering a well-received commencement address.'' This is what Barbara Bush said: '' 'Maybe we should adjust faster, maybe we should adjust slower,' she told the graduates. 'But whatever the era, whatever the times, one thing will never change: fathers and mothers. If you have children, they must come first. You must read to your children, and you must hug your children, and you must love your children. Your success as a family, our success as a society depends not on what happens in the White House, but on what happens inside your house.' ''

Meacham goes on, ''She received her most sustained applause when she remarked that perhaps there was someone in the audience that day who would, like her, one day preside over the White House as the president's spouse. 'And I wish him well,' she said, to cheers from the crowd.'' So Barbara Bush, we wish you well on your 91st birthday and we're grateful for your lifetime of commitment to our children, our country, and to literacy.

RECOGNIZING MICHAEL FELDMAN'S WHAD'YA KNOW

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. President, today, I wish to commemorate Michael Feldman's Whad'Ya Know, the live, 2-hour weekly Wisconsin public radio program as it nears the end of production after a tremendously entertaining 31-year run.

Michael, a Milwaukee native, University of Wisconsin graduate, and self-described ''kosher beefcake,'' created one of the most successful programs in WPR history. Broadcasting live from their radio home at Monona Terrace in my hometown of Madison, WI, Michael and his team have found a home on Saturday morning in the hearts of millions of people. They have brought their listeners a uniquely Wisconsin blend of humor, taking us on a trip into the Whad'Ya Know world of comedy, satire, quizzes and interviews. From covering ''all the news that isn't'' to delighting audiences across the country on his road show tours, Michael has established this show as a reason to get out of bed early on Saturday and a good excuse to put off shoveling snow.

I am pleased to honor the work of Michael Feldman and all who have contributed to the success of Whad'Ya Know. They should all be proud of the joy they have brought to so many. When asked about the show, Michael has commented, ''It may be called Michael Feldman's Whad'Ya Know?, but it really has been Everybody Who Listens And Comes To The Shows's Whad'Ya Know?'' With that being said, after Whad'Ya Know airs its final broadcast on June 25, 2016, Wisconsinites across the State will be missing a longstanding part of our community. We may laugh a little less, but we will never forget all the smiles he put on people's faces.

It has been my delight to be a featured guest on Whad'Ya Know several times, and I will appear for the last time on June 11, 2016. I wish Michael and the entire Whad'Ya Know staff all the best for their remaining shows and for their future plans.

With the end of this show, there is only one question left to ask and one answer to give:

Well, whad'ya know?

Not much, you?

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO BOB BURG

● Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, today I want to take a few minutes and recognize an outstanding achievement by one of my constituents, Mr. Bob Burg. His story offers us a good lesson about perseverance and the importance of lifelong learning. His story should inspire others.

After dropping out of school in the 11th grade, Mr. Burg went on to serve in the Air Force for 4 years. Following his service in the Air Force, he worked for 35 years in his family business. Eventually, Mr. Burg retired from that position saying, ''I had nothing to do. I have plenty of hobbies, but you can only fill up your life so much with hobbies.''

Instead, he felt that retirement left a void in his life, so Mr. Burg decided to fill the void by enrolling at the University of South Carolina in Columbia.

Mr. Burg, then age 74, said he wasn't the best student in high school many years ago. In fact, he admitted his academic shortcomings in his younger days.

Mr. Burg also shared some humorous observations about what it was like to go back to college and be surrounded by fellow students several decades younger: ''I walked into school and one of the young girls said, 'Mr. Burg, are you over 60?' I laughed and said 'honey, you were in diapers when I turned 60.' ''

Well, I am proud to report that Mr. Burg, now age 78, just graduated from the University of South Carolina with a degree in history. His story serves as an example to us all that education, whether in life or the classroom, can be a lifelong endeavor.

In his nearly eight decades of life he has earned many titles—veteran who served his Nation, valued employee in the family business, retiree, and now his newest title—college graduate.

Job well done, Mr. Burg.●

TRIBUTE TO ANNE GRIFFITH AND RECOGNIZING MAINE'S LAW ENFORCEMENT COMMUNITY

● Mr. KING. Mr. President, this past May, members of Maine's law enforcement community gathered with the members of the public at Mount Hope Cemetery in Augusta to honor the more than 80 officers who have given their lives in the line of duty.

In Maine, where we have more than 2,000 sworn police officers, this ceremony is both a longstanding and cherished tradition, and this year represented the 25th consecutive time that the Maine Chiefs of Police Association and the Maine Sheriffs Association

have come together in commemoration of their fallen brethren.

But for one person, this year's ceremony also marked a different anniversary.

Anne Griffith, whom many of us know more affectionately as Woolie, was just 3 years old when on April 15, 1996, her father, Maine State trooper James ''Drew'' Griffith, was killed in a car accident while pursuing a speeding vehicle. I first met Woolie in the days that followed—at her father's funeral, as she endured an experience that no child should have to and as I, then Governor, attempted to convey the deep gratitude of a State that mourned alongside her.

She was strong then, just as she is strong now. Woolie is now 25 years old, and this year marks two decades since her father's death—and in that time, she has grown into a wonderful young woman—raised by her mother, Maine Warden Chaplain Kate Braestrup.

In a remarkable testament to her fortitude and strength of character, Woolie several years ago made the conscious decision to follow in her father's footsteps by entering the ranks of the Maine State police. Today, she serves as an investigative analyst for the Maine State Police Computer Crimes Unit, donning the same blue uniform once worn so proudly by her father; surrounded by many of the same dedicated public servants who stood beside him years ago.

Woolie spoke at the Maine Law Enforcement Officers Memorial Service in May. Her words were a powerful tribute to the law enforcement community, not only because they speak so well to their constant and ever-present work and vigilance to keep us safe, but also because they so aptly capture the unfailing love and kindness that too often is overlooked today.

I deeply hope that future generations of Americans may look at her father's life, his legacy, and her tribute to him and to the law enforcement community and come to more deeply understand and appreciate the sacrifices of those who protect us every day.

Mr. President, I ask that Anne Griffith's remarks at the Maine Law Enforcement Officers Memorial Service on May 19, 2016, be printed in the RECORD.

The material follows:

[May 19, 2016]

GOOD HOPE CEMETERY—AUGUSTA, MAINE

(By Anne Griffith)

Good morning,

My name is Anne Griffith. I am the youngest of four children of Maine Warden Chaplain Kate Braestrup and fallen Maine State Trooper Drew Griffith.

It is a privilege to stand with you, and honor my father today. On behalf of the families of the fallen, I thank you all for being here.

As the youngest of Drew's children, I was three years old when my dad died, too young to form clear memories.

I did not have much of a chance to experience him as a father, and my memories of him are vague and uncertain.

What I had, growing up, were stories—stories of his intelligence, his kindness, and his humor—told to me by those who had known him well: my mother, and my siblings of course, my family . . . and my blue family, too. Law enforcement officers who worked with Dad supported us, shared our sadness and kept us close over the years, caring for him by caring for us. They, too, gave me my father in stories.

And so, two decades later I am still a part of that blue family.

In 2014 I worked as a Reserve Patrol Officer. During this time, I thought often of my dad. I got a glimpse of him—his sorrows and satisfactions—through performing the tasks that he performed; I placed handcuffs on offenders while they fought me.

I performed CPR on two victims . . . and could not save them.

I helped in preventing the suicide of a mentally ill woman.

For the past year, I have worked as an Investigative Analyst for the Computer Crimes Unit. During this time I have assisted in a variety of cases from child pornography possession to child molestation offenses.

Because of the nature of my work for the Unit, I can definitively point to particular cases and know for certain that I made a difference in the outcome of the investigation. There is a satisfaction in this that my father felt . . . and I have felt it, too.

I know there is no greater sense of honor and purpose than participating in the protection of innocent human lives. This is what my father died doing.

Besides working with an incredible team, I am fortunate to work closely with those who knew and loved my father—Lt. Glenn Lang who helped to carry his casket, Sgt. Laurie Northrup who once told me her last conversation with my dad was of how much he loved his wife and children; Computer Analyst Andrea Donovan, who worked as a State Police Dispatcher and heard my Dad sign on 10–8, and sign off 10–7.

I am able to know my father through them, just as they are able to know him through me.

April 15, 2016 marked the 20th Anniversary of my father's line of duty death.

To mark the day, I went for a run.

A sergeant of the Maine State Police K9 Unit, and a recently graduated State Trooper ran with me, in the area where I grew up—and Dad's patrol area.

We ended up at Marshall Point Lighthouse in Port Clyde, where a bench dedicated in my father's name is placed. The sky was clear blue and the air was crisp with salt from the nearby ocean.

Neither the sergeant nor the brand-new trooper had ever shaken my father's hand, or laughed at his jokes. Still, they are his family, they are his brothers. They ran with him by running with me.

The law enforcement family is large; it crosses state lines and international borders. Though my siblings and I lost our father, we did not lose our connection to his legacy, nor the family he became a part of when he joined the Maine State Police in 1986. I know who my father was because I know you—his brothers and sisters in uniform, intelligent, good-humored and kind—who continue to serve and protect the people of Maine and of the United States. In honoring my father today, I honor you.

Thank you.●

100TH ANNIVERSARY OF SINCLAIR OIL

● Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, today, on behalf of myself and Senator MIKE CRAPO, I wish to recognize and celebrate the 100th anniversary of Sinclair Oil Corporation. A family-owned company, Sinclair Oil is one of the oldest continuously operated brands in the oil business.

On May 1, 1916, Harry F. Sinclair founded the Sinclair Oil and Refining Corporation. Three years later, the company had grown to four times its original size. In the 1920s, Sinclair introduced America to the ''first modern service station,'' providing people and families with a place to get an oil change, fix minor vehicle repairs, and public restrooms that motorists could use. By creating a modern service station, Sinclair paved the way for the American road trip.

The Great Depression was a time of growth for Sinclair Oil as they bought companies that were going under. If not for Sinclair, these companies would have completely disappeared, taking away countless jobs and revenue for local communities. In 1930, Dino the Dinosaur became the company's mascot and logo. To this day, Dino remains a visible fixture in Idaho and all across the Rocky Mountain region. During World War II, Sinclair supported the Allies with high-octane fuel, tankers, and more.

After Harry F. Sinclair retired as president in January 1949, the company had several different owners including Atlantic Richfield Company and PASCO, Inc., until 1976, when Robert Earl Holding acquired Sinclair Oil. Known for his steadiness and warmth, Earl Holding made Sinclair feel like a mom-and-pop business. Further testament to Earl Holding and his legacy, Dale Ensign, former executive president of Sinclair, once said ''the employees learned over a period of time that he would do what he said he would do.''

Earl Holding was actively involved in the management and leadership of Sinclair Oil until 2009. Currently, the Holding family continues to own and run the business under the leadership of Mr. ROSS Matthews, CEO and chairman of the board of Sinclair Oil Corporation.

Today Sinclair Oil Corporation includes more than 1,300 Sinclair-branded stations in 24 States, mostly west of the Mississippi River, and is the largest refinery operation in the Rocky Mountain region. In addition to being a fully integrated oil company, Sinclair also has hospitality and ranching ventures, including the Grand America Hotel in Salt Lake City, the Little America hotels and travel centers, the Westgate Hotel in San Diego, and Sun Valley Resort in my home State, Idaho.

So today we recognize Sinclair Oil Corporation for achieving this historic 100-year milestone and applaud their entire community for the contributions they have made to Idaho and across our country throughout the years.●

TRIBUTE TO W. EDGAR WELDEN

● Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize Edgar Welden of Birmingham, AL, for being named the Alabama Sports Hall of Fame's 2016 ''Distinguished American Sportsman.'' Edgar is a distinguished businessman and friend whose life has been marked by service to the people of his community, State, and Nation. His untiring work to benefit young people through athletics makes him most deserving of this honor.

Edgar has an extraordinary record of accomplishment. A Wetumpka native, he grew up with a great passion for sports, playing football, baseball, and basketball in high school before earning a degree from the University of Alabama. His passion for athletics has only grown since then. In fact, he spent 1997 traveling to seven continents and all 50 states to attend more than 250 sporting events, and he chronicled his journeys in his book ''Time Out! A Sports Fan's Dream Year.''

One of his most valuable contributions to Alabama was his service as director of the important Alabama Development Office and the Alabama Department of Economic and Community Affairs and as special assistant to the Governor for Economic Affairs. He has been widely recognized as one of the key players in Governor Guy Hunt's successful first term. This work for the State, performed on a volunteer basis, earned him recognition in 1987 by the Alabama Broadcasters Association as Alabama's Citizen of the Year. In 1988, he was appointed by Governor Hunt as voluntary chairman of the Alabama Reunion, a 2-year statewide celebration and promotion of the State's heritage and economic development opportunities. As the architect of this nationally recognized program, he was awarded the 1992 National Governor's Association Award for Distinguished Service to State Government.

Despite his impressive accomplishments in government, business, and politics, it is through athletics that he has had perhaps his greatest influence. Edgar has a special place in his heart for young people, and with his keen insight, he has found ways to utilize athletics to promote character and education and improve the lives of young people across our State.

His accomplishments in this regard are too many to list comprehensively. His work with high school athletics includes the Crippled Children's Foundation, where he currently serves as chairman, and the Monday Morning Quarterback Club, where he is a board member. In 2002, he founded the nonprofit Birmingham Athletic Partnership to support the city's middle and high school athletic programs. This program has provided Birmingham city schools with over $3.5 million in financial support. Edgar believes that children in the inner city should have the same chances for athletic success as better funded programs and his goal is to ensure their athletes, bands, and cheerleaders are able to compete on a level playing field. In addition, since 2003, he has served as the chairman and president of the hugely successful Bryant-Jordan Scholarship Program, which has awarded over $9 million college scholarships to more than 2,700 student-athletes in Alabama who excelled athletically and scholastically while overcoming adversity. In 2006, he was appointed by President George W. Bush to serve as a member of the President's Council on Physical Fitness & Sports.

Edgar also serves as chairman of the Alabama Sports Hall of Fame Museum, a true State treasure which maintains for generations to come the stories of legendary Alabama athletes whose stories never fail to inspire us today. Many say it is the best sports hall of fame in America. And in a great victory for the city of Birmingham, he cochaired the committee that landed the 2021 World Games. This was a huge effort to land this event, and Edgar used all his energy and people skills to do so. He was inducted into the Alabama High School Sports Hall of Fame in 2007 and was recently elected to the board of directors of the National Football Foundation. Indeed, while he would never say so himself, perhaps no other sportsman in the country has done more for their State than Edgar has for Alabama.

Edgar also serves on the president's cabinet at the University of Alabama and, in 2010, was honored with the Distinguished Alumnus Award. He has accomplished all of this while building a successful business career in real estate development and property management. An essential part of his success has been the support and partnership of his wonderful wife, Louise. She is a star in her own right and has always enjoyed seeing young people grow and progress. They are a great pair. Edgar and Louise get great pleasure out of random acts of kindness. On a plane flight, Edgar met the wife of a soldier that was returning from combat—so typical of his generosity, Edgar arranged for them to have the honeymoon suite in his hotel for free. Edgar and Louise are people of generosity, patriotism, and positive spirit. To know Edgar and Louise is to love them.

For all of his accomplishments, I commend and congratulate my friend today. Being named to receive the Distinguished American Sportsman Award is a fitting honor indeed. It is appropriate that our Nation pauses periodically to recognize, celebrate, and give thanks to citizens like Edgar and Louise whose lives make our country so wonderful.●

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 12:20 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 87. An act to modify the boundary of the Shiloh National Military Park located in Tennessee and Mississippi, to establish Parker's Crossroads Battlefield as an affiliated area of the National Park System, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1815. An act to facilitate certain pinyon-juniper related projects in Lincoln County, Nevada, to modify the boundaries of certain wilderness areas in the State of Nevada, and to provide for the implementation of a conservation plan for the Virgin River, Nevada.

H.R. 2009. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain land inholdings owned by the United States to the Tucson Unified School District and to the Pascua Yaqui Tribe of Arizona.

H.R. 2733. An act to require the Secretary of the Interior to take land into trust for certain Indian tribes, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3070. An act to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to permit striped bass fishing in the Exclusive Economic Zone transit zone between Montauk, New York, and Point Judith, Rhode Island, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4904. An act to require the Director of the Office of Management and Budget to issue a directive on the management of software licenses, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4906. An act to amend title 5, United States Code, to clarify the eligibility of employees of a land management agency in a time-limited appointment to compete for a permanent appointment at any Federal agency, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5273. An act to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for regulatory relief under the Medicare program for certain providers of services and suppliers and increased transparency in hospital coding and enrollment data, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5338. An act to reduce passenger wait times at airports, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House has agreed to the following concurrent resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 129. Concurrent resolution expressing support for the goal of ensuring that all Holocaust victims live with dignity, comfort, and security in their remaining years, and urging the Federal Republic of Germany to continue to reaffirm its commitment to this goal through a financial commitment to comprehensively address the unique health and welfare needs of vulnerable Holocaust victims, including home care and other medically prescribed needs.

The message also announced that pursuant to section 3(a) of the Evidence-Based Policy Commission Act of 2016 (Public Law 114–140), and the order of the House of January 6, 2015, the Speaker appoints the following individuals on the part of the House of Representatives to the Commission on Evidence-Based Policymaking: Mr. Ron Haskins of Rockville, Maryland, Co-Chairman, Mr. Bruce Meyer of Chicago, Illinois, and Mr. Robert Hahn of Hillsboro Beach, Florida.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 87. An act to modify the boundary of the Shiloh National Military Park located in Tennessee and Mississippi, to establish Parker's Crossroads Battlefield as an affiliated

area of the National Park System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 1815. An act to facilitate certain pinyon-juniper related projects in Lincoln County, Nevada, to modify the boundaries of certain wilderness areas in the State of Nevada, and to provide for the implementation of a conservation plan for the Virgin River, Nevada; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 2009. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain land inholdings owned by the United States to the Tucson Unified School District and to the Pascua Yaqui Tribe of Arizona; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 3070. An act to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to permit striped bass fishing in the Exclusive Economic Zone transit zone between Montauk, New York, and Point Judith, Rhode Island, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

H.R. 4904. An act to require the Director of the Office of Management and Budget to issue a directive on the management of software licenses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 4906. An act to amend title 5, United States Code, to clarify the eligibility of employees of a land management agency in a time-limited appointment to compete for a permanent appointment at any Federal agency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 5273. An act to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for regulatory relief under the Medicare program for certain providers of services and suppliers and increased transparency in hospital coding and enrollment data, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

H.R. 5338. An act to reduce passenger wait times at airports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

The following concurrent resolution was read, and referred as indicated:

H. Con. Res. 129. Concurrent resolution expressing support for the goal of ensuring that all Holocaust victims live with dignity, comfort, and security in their remaining years, and urging the Federal Republic of Germany to continue to reaffirm its commitment to this goal through a financial commitment to comprehensively address the unique health and welfare needs of vulnerable Holocaust victims, including home care and other medically prescribed needs; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC–5637. A communication from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General James F. Jackson, United States Air Force Reserve, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–5638. A communication from the Acting Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting the report of four (4) officers authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of brigadier general in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–5639. A communication from the Acting Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting the report of three (3) officers authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of rear admiral or rear admiral (lower half), as indicated, in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–5640. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Manpower and Reserve Affairs), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the mobilizations of select reserve units, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 6, 2016; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–5641. A communication from the Acting Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting the report of nine (9) officers authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of major general in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–5642. A communication from the Secretary, Division of Corporation Finance, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Form 10-K Summary'' (RIN3235–AL89) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 3, 2016; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–5643. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Revisions to Definitions in the Export Administration Regulations'' (RIN0694–AG32) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 3, 2016; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–5644. A communication from the Chair of the Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System, transmitting, pursuant to law, the 102nd Annual Report of the Federal Reserve Board covering operations for calendar year 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–5645. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Nevada: Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revisions'' (FRL No. 9947–28–Region 9) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 1, 2016; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–5646. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Partial Approval and Partial Disapproval of Air Quality State Implementation Plans; Arizona; Infrastructure Requirements to Address Interstate Transport for the 2008 Ozone NAAQS; Correction'' (FRL No. 9947–27–Region 9) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 1, 2016; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–5647. A communication from the Chairman, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Report to Congress on Abnormal Occurrences: Fiscal Year (FY) 2015''; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–5648. A communication from the Regulations Coordinator, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Medicare Programs; Medicare Shared Savings Program; Accountable Care Organizations—Revised Benchmark Rebasing Methodology, Facilitating Transition to Performance-Based Risk, and Administrative Finality of Financial Calculations'' ((RIN0938–AS67) (CMS–1644-F)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 7, 2016; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–5649. A communication from the Regulations Coordinator, Administration for Community Living, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''State Health Insurance Assistance Program (SHIP)'' (RIN0985–AA11) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 7, 2016; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–5650. A communication from the Director of Regulations and Policy Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Food Labeling: Revision of the Nutrition and Supplemental Facts Labels'' ((RIN0910–AF22) (Docket No. FDA–2012–N–1210)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 3, 2016; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–5651. communication from the Director of Regulations and Policy Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Mitigation Strategies to Protect Food Against Intentional Adulteration'' ((RIN0910–AG63) (Docket No. FDA–2013–N–1425)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 3, 2016; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–5652. A communication from the Director of Regulations and Policy Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Food Labeling: Serving Sizes of Foods That Can Reasonably Be Consumed At One Eating Occasion; Dual-Column Labeling; Updating, Modifying, and Establishing Certain Reference Amounts Customarily Consumed; Serving Size for Breath Mints; and Technical Amendments'' ((RIN0910–AF23) (Docket No. FDA–2004–N–0258)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 3, 2016; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–5653. A communication from the Regulations Coordinator, Administration for Community Living, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Administration for Community Living—Regulatory Consolidation'' (45 CFR Parts 1321, 1322, 1323, 1324, 1325, 1326, 1327, 1328, 1385, 1386, 1387, and 1388) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 2, 2016; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–5654. A communication from the Chairman, U.S. Election Assistance Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission's Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from October 1, 2015 through March 31, 2016; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5655. A communication from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department of Labor's Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from October 1, 2015 through March 31, 2016; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5656. A communication from the Board Members of the Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from October 1, 2015 through

March 31, 2016; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5657. A communication from the Chief Executive Officer, Corporation for National and Community Service, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Semiannual Report of the Inspector General and the Corporation for National and Community Service's Response and Report on Final Action for the period from October 1, 2015 through March 31, 2016; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5658. A communication from the Inspector General of the General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from October 1, 2015 through March 31, 2016; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5659. A communication from the Chief Executive Officer, Millennium Challenge Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Office of Inspector General's Semiannual Report for the period of October 1, 2015 through March 31, 2016, and the Millennium Challenge Corporation's response; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5660. A communication from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department of Defense Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from October 1, 2015 through March 31, 2016; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5661. A communication from the Chairman, U.S. Election Assistance Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission's Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from October 1, 2015 through March 31, 2016; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5662. A communication from the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Fiscal Year 2015 Annual Report on Advisory Neighborhood Commissions''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5663. A communication from the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''The Impact of 'Ban the Box' in the District of Columbia''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5664. A communication from the Executive Director of the Federal Labor Relations Authority, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Office of Inspector General Semiannual Report for the period of October 1, 2015 through March 31, 2016; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5665. A communication from the Acting Deputy Chief Financial Officer and Director for Financial Management, Office of the Chief Financial Officer and Assistant Secretary for Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Commerce Debt Collection'' (RIN0605–AA40) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 3, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5666. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Economic Exclusive Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Trawl Catcher Vessels in the Western Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska'' (RIN0648–XE505) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 3, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5667. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fluensulfone; Pesticide Tolerances'' (FRL No. 9946–07) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 27, 2016; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–5668. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fluazinam; Pesticide Tolerances; Technical Correction'' (FRL No. 9945–05) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 27, 2016; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–5669. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Aldicard, Alternaria destruens, Ampelomyces quisqualis, Azinphos-methyl, Etridiazole, Fenarimol, et al.; Tolerance Exemption Actions'' (FRL No. 9943–73) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 27, 2016; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–5670. A communication from the Acting Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Mexican Hass Avocado Import Program'' ((RIN0579–AE05) (Docket No. APHIS–2014–0088)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 31, 2016; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–5671. A communication from the Judicial Proceedings Panel, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Statistical Data Regarding Military Adjudication of Sexual Assault Offenses''; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–5672. A communication from the Acting Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting a report on the approved retirement of General Mark A. Welsh III, United States Air Force, and his advancement to the grade of general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–5673. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled, ''Ground/Air Task Oriented Radar''; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–5674. A communication from the President and Chief Executive Officer, Federal Home Loan Bank of Topeka, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Bank's management reports and statements on system of internal controls for fiscal year 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–5675. A communication from the General Counsel of the National Credit Union Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Risk Based Capital'' (RIN3133–AD77) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 31, 2016; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–5676. A communication from the General Counsel of the National Credit Union Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Member Business Loans; Commercial Lending'' (RIN3133–AE37) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 31, 2016; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–5677. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulations, Office of the Secretary, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Removal of the Equal Employment Opportunity; Policy, Procedures and Programs Regulation'' (RIN2501–AD78) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 31, 2016; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–5678. A communication from the Director of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Assessments'' (RIN3064–AE37) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 31, 2016; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–5679. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to the Western Balkans that was declared in Executive Order 13219 of June 26, 2001; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–5680. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to North Korea that was declared in Executive Order 13466 of June 26, 2008; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–5681. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Energy Conservation Program: Test Procedures for Portable Air Conditioners'' ((RIN1904–AD22) (Docket No. EERE–2014–BT–TP–0014)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 2, 2016; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–5682. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Finding of Attainment and Approval of Attainment Plan for Klamath Falls, Oregon Fine Particulate Matter Nonattainment Area'' (FRL No. 9947–23–Region 10) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 27, 2016; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–5683. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Wyoming; Revisions to Wyoming Air Quality Standards and Regulations; Chapter 6, Permitting Requirements, Section 13, Nonattainment New Source Review Permit Requirements, and Section 14, Incorporation By Reference'' (FRL No. 9947–13–Region 8) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 27, 2016; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–5684. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Air Plan Approval; North Carolina; Prong 4–2008 Ozone, 2010 NO2, SO2, and 2012 PM2.5'' (FRL No. 9947–22–Region 4) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 27,

2016; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–5685. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulations and Reports Clearance, Social Security Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Extension of Expiration Dates for Two Body System Listings'' (RIN0960–AI00) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 2, 2016; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–5686. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Credit for Renewable Electricity Production and Refined Coal Production, and Publication of Inflation Adjustment Factor and Reference Prices for Calendar Year 2016'' (Notice 2016–34) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 26, 2016; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–5687. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) and 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 16–015); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–5688. A communication from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Case-Zablocki Act, 1 U.S.C. 112b, as amended, the report of the texts and background statements of international agreements, other than treaties (List 2016–0071 - 2016–0076); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–5689. A communication from the General Counsel, National Science Foundation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report relative to a vacancy for the position of Deputy Director, National Science Foundation, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 26, 2016; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–5690. A communication from the Deputy Inspector General, Office of Inspector General, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department of the Interior's Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from October 1, 2015 through March 31, 2016;; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5691. A communication from the Inspector General, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from October 1, 2015 through March 31, 2016; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5692. A communication from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from October 1, 2015 through March 31, 2016; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5693. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department's Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from October 1, 2015 through March 31, 2016; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5694. A communication from the Chief of the Office of Regulatory Affairs, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Federal Firearms License Proceedings—Hearings'' (RIN1140–AA38) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 26, 2016; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–5695. A communication from the Federal Liaison Officer, Patent and Trademark Office, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''USPTO Law School Clinic Certification Program'' (RIN0651–AC99) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 31, 2016; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–5696. A communication from the Director of Regulation Policy and Management, Veterans Health Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Mailing Address of the Board of Veterans' Appeals'' (RIN2900–AP71) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 26, 2016; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC–5697. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Atlantic Bluefin Tuna Fisheries'' (RIN0648–XE579) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 2, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5698. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Vessels Using Pot Gear in the Central Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska'' (RIN0648–XE556) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 2, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5699. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Catcher Vessels Using Trawl Gear in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area'' (RIN0648–XE557) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 2, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5700. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Catcher Vessels Using Trawl Gear in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area'' (RIN0648–XE611) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 2, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5701. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod in the Bering Sea Subarea of the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area'' (RIN0648–XE563) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 2, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5702. A communication from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Sablefish Managed Under the Individual Fishing Quota Program'' (RIN0648–XE507) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 2, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5703. A communication from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Television Broadcasting Services; Scottsbluff, Nebraska and Sidney, Nebraska'' ((MB Docket No. 16–29) (DA 16–543)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 2, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5704. A communication from the Chief, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of the Commission's Rules with Regard to Commercial Operations in the 2550–2650 MHz Band'' ((FCC 16–55) (GN Docket No. 12–354)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 2, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5705. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Deep-Water Species Fishery by Vessels Using Trawl Gear in the Gulf of Alaska'' (RIN0648–XE623) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 2, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. THUNE, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 1935. A bill to require the Secretary of Commerce to undertake certain activities to support waterfront community revitalization and resiliency (Rept. No. 114–272).

By Mr. COCHRAN, from the Committee on Appropriations:

Special Report entitled ''Further Revised Allocation to Subcommittees of Budget Totals for Fiscal Years 2016 and 2017'' (Rept. No. 114–273).

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. TESTER:

S. 3030. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to count resident time spent in a critical access hospital as resident time spent in a nonprovider setting for purposes of making Medicare direct and indirect graduate medical education payments; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MURPHY:

S. 3031. A bill to require certain standards and enforcement provisions to prevent child abuse and neglect in residential programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. ISAKSON (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MORAN, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. HELLER, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BROWN, Mr. TESTER, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. MANCHIN):

S. 3032. A bill to provide for an increase, effective December 1, 2016, in the rates of compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for the

survivors of certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MARKEY:

S. 3033. A bill to provide for an Atomic Veterans Service Medal; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CRUZ (for himself, Mr. LEE, and Mr. LANKFORD):

S. 3034. A bill to prohibit the National Telecommunications and Information Administration from allowing the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority functions contract to lapse unless specifically authorized to do so by an Act of Congress; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. HELLER (for himself and Mr. TESTER):

S. 3035. A bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out a pilot program to increase the use of medical scribes to maximize the efficiency of physicians at medical facilities of the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. REED, Ms. WARREN, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. BROWN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 3036. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for an investment tax credit related to the production of electricity from offshore wind; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. COTTON (for himself and Mr. LEE):

S. 3037. A bill to help individuals receiving disability insurance benefits under title II of the Social Security Act obtain rehabilitative services and return to the workforce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. NELSON (for himself and Mr. WICKER):

S. 3038. A bill to reauthorize the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 83

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 83, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to improve nonretaliation provisions relating to equal pay requirements.

S. 356

At the request of Mr. LEE, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 356, a bill to improve the provisions relating to the privacy of electronic communications.

S. 366

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 366, a bill to require Senate candidates to file designations, statements, and reports in electronic form.

S. 386

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 386, a bill to limit the authority of States to tax certain income of employees for employment duties performed in other States.

S. 1212

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1212, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and the Small Business Act to expand the availability of employee stock ownership plans in S corporations, and for other purposes.

S. 1378

At the request of Mr. PAUL, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1378, a bill to strengthen employee cost savings suggestions programs within the Federal Government.

S. 1555

At the request of Ms. HIRONO, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1555, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the Filipino veterans of World War II, in recognition of the dedicated service of the veterans during World War II.

S. 1858

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1858, a bill to prohibit discrimination on the basis of sex, gender identity, and sexual orientation, and for other purposes.

S. 2593

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2593, a bill to require the Secretary of Labor to maintain a publicly available list of all employers that relocate a call center overseas, to make such companies ineligible for Federal grants or guaranteed loans, and to require disclosure of the physical location of business agents engaging in customer service communications, and for other purposes.

S. 2599

At the request of Mrs. MCCASKILL, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2599, a bill to prohibit unfair and deceptive advertising of hotel room rates, and for other purposes.

S. 2652

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2652, a bill to extend the authorization of the Highlands Conservation Act.

S. 2707

At the request of Mr. SCOTT, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2707, a bill to require the Secretary of Labor to nullify the proposed rule regarding defining and delimiting the exemptions for executive, administrative, professional, outside sales, and computer employees, to require the Secretary of Labor to conduct a full and complete economic analysis with improved economic data on small businesses, nonprofit employers, Medicare or Medicaid dependent health care providers, and small governmental jurisdictions, and all other employers, and minimize the impact on such employers, before promulgating any substantially similar rule, and to provide a rule of construction regarding the salary threshold exemption under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, and for other purposes.

S. 2773

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2773, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide more effective remedies to victims of discrimination in the payment of wages on the basis of sex, and for other purposes.

S. 2823

At the request of Mrs. CAPITO, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2823, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend and modify the section 45 credit for refined coal from steel industry fuel, and for other purposes.

S. 2890

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2890, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in recognition of Christa McAuliffe.

S. 2912

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON, the names of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 2912, a bill to authorize the use of unapproved medical products by patients diagnosed with a terminal illness in accordance with State law, and for other purposes.

S. 2979

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2979, a bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to require candidates of major parties for the office of President to disclose recent tax return information.

S. 3007

At the request of Mr. COTTON, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3007, a bill to prohibit funds from being obligated or expended to aid, support, permit, or facilitate the certification or approval of any new sensor for use by the Russian Federation on observation flights under the Open Skies Treaty unless the President submits a certification related to such sensor to Congress and for other purposes.

S. 3009

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 3009, a bill to support entrepreneurs serving in the National Guard and Reserve, and for other purposes.

S. 3018

At the request of Mr. KING, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO)

was added as a cosponsor of S. 3018, a bill to provide for the establishment of a pilot program to identify security vulnerabilities of certain entities in the energy sector.

S. CON. RES. 36

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) and the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) were added as cosponsors of S. Con. Res. 36, a concurrent resolution expressing support of the goal of ensuring that all Holocaust victims live with dignity, comfort, and security in their remaining years, and urging the Federal Republic of Germany to reaffirm its commitment to that goal through a financial commitment to comprehensively address the unique health and welfare needs of vulnerable Holocaust victims, including home care and other medically prescribed needs.

S. RES. 340

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 340, a resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the so-called Islamic State in Iraq and al-Sham (ISIS or Da'esh) is committing genocide, crimes against humanity, and war crimes, and calling upon the President to work with foreign governments and the United Nations to provide physical protection for ISIS' targets, to support the creation of an international criminal tribunal with jurisdiction to punish these crimes, and to use every reasonable means, including sanctions, to destroy ISIS and disrupt its support networks.

S. RES. 479

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 479, a resolution urging the Government of the Democratic Republic of the Congo to comply with constitutional limits on presidential terms and fulfill its constitutional mandate for a democratic transition of power in 2016.

S. RES. 482

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. COATS) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 482, a resolution urging the European Union to designate Hizballah in its entirety as a terrorist organization and to increase pressure on the organization and its members to the fullest extent possible.

S. RES. 483

At the request of Mr. ALEXANDER, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. CORKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 483, a resolution designating June 20, 2016, as ''American Eagle Day'' and celebrating the recovery and restoration of the bald eagle, the national symbol of the United States.

AMENDMENT NO. 4067

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS), the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 4067 intended to be proposed to S. 2943, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 4092

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 4092 intended to be proposed to S. 2943, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 4118

At the request of Mr. PERDUE, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 4118 intended to be proposed to S. 2943, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 4120

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 4120 intended to be proposed to S. 2943, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 4129

At the request of Mr. GARDNER, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 4129 intended to be proposed to S. 2943, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 4136

At the request of Mr. HOEVEN, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 4136 intended to be proposed to S. 2943, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 4145

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 4145 intended to be proposed to S. 2943, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 4158

At the request of Mr. BOOZMAN, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 4158 intended to be proposed to S. 2943, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 4215

At the request of Mr. REID, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 4215 intended to be proposed to S. 2943, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 4222

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 4222 intended to be proposed to S. 2943, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 4241

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 4241 intended to be proposed to S. 2943, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 4253

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, her name was added as a cosponsor of

amendment No. 4253 intended to be proposed to S. 2943, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 4267

At the request of Mr. COCHRAN, the names of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) and the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 4267 intended to be proposed to S. 2943, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 4277

At the request of Mr. LEE, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mrs. ERNST) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 4277 intended to be proposed to S. 2943, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 4310

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 4310 intended to be proposed to S. 2943, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 4325

At the request of Mr. KIRK, the names of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) and the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 4325 intended to be proposed to S. 2943, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 4333

At the request of Mr. UDALL, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 4333 intended to be proposed to S. 2943, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 4339

At the request of Mr. CARPER, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 4339 intended to be proposed to S. 2943, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 4343

At the request of Mr. CASEY, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 4343 intended to be proposed to S. 2943, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 4370

At the request of Mr. KIRK, the names of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) and the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 4370 intended to be proposed to S. 2943, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 4401

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 4401 intended to be proposed to S. 2943, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 4410

At the request of Mr. CARPER, the names of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY), the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 4410 intended to be proposed to S. 2943, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 4414

At the request of Mr. KAINE, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 4414 intended to be proposed to S. 2943, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 4424

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 4424 intended to be proposed to S. 2943, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 4433

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 4433 intended to be proposed to S. 2943, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 4437

At the request of Mrs. MCCASKILL, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 4437 intended to be proposed to S. 2943, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 4438

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the names of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) and the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 4438 intended to be proposed to S. 2943, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 4446

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 4446 intended to be proposed to S. 2943, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and

for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 4448

At the request of Mr. LEE, the names of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 4448 intended to be proposed to S. 2943, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 4452

At the request of Mr. HEINRICH, the names of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 4452 intended to be proposed to S. 2943, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 4456

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 4456 intended to be proposed to S. 2943, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 4457

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 4457 intended to be proposed to S. 2943, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 4483

At the request of Mr. COTTON, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 4483 intended to be proposed to S. 2943, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 4502

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 4502 intended to be proposed to S. 2943, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 4504

At the request of Mr. HOEVEN, the names of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) and the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 4504 intended to be proposed to S. 2943, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 4509

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the names of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) and the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 4509 intended to be proposed to S. 2943, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 4514

At the request of Mr. VITTER, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 4514 intended to be proposed to S. 2943, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 4517

At the request of Mr. BURR, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 4517 intended to be proposed to S. 2943, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 4542

At the request of Ms. HIRONO, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 4542 intended to be proposed to S. 2943, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 4554. Mr. ISAKSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4555. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4556. Mr. COCHRAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4557. Mr. PETERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4558. Mr. BENNET (for himself and Mr. HATCH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4559. Mr. BURR (for himself, Mr. TILLIS, and Mr. NELSON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4560. Mr. COATS (for himself and Mr. RUBIO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4561. Mr. BARRASSO (for himself, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. DAINES, Mr. ENZI, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. VITTER, Mr. WICKER, Mr. LEE, Mr. CORNYN, and Mr. HATCH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4562. Mr. FLAKE (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. CARDIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4563. Mr. SCOTT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4564. Mr. CARPER (for himself and Mr. LEAHY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4565. Mr. FRANKEN (for himself and Ms. KLOBUCHAR) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4566. Ms. HIRONO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2943, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4567. Ms. BALDWIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2943, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4568. Mrs. MURRAY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2943, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4569. Mrs. MURRAY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her

to the bill S. 2943, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4570. Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4571. Mr. MORAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4572. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4573. Ms. HEITKAMP submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2943, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4574. Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. COONS, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. SANDERS, and Mr. BOOKER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4575. Mr. MCCAIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4576. Mr. TILLIS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4577. Mr. SCHATZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4578. Ms. HIRONO (for herself and Mr. CORNYN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2943, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4579. Mr. BENNET submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4580. Mr. CASSIDY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4581. Mr. SULLIVAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4582. Ms. HIRONO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2943, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4583. Mr. REID (for Mr. WARNER (for himself and Mr. BLUNT)) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. REID to the bill S. 2943, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4584. Mr. TESTER (for himself and Mr. ROUNDS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4585. Mr. CORNYN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4586. Mr. HELLER (for himself, Mr. REID, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4587. Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Mr. MCCAIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2943, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4588. Mr. BOOZMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4589. Mr. HEINRICH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4590. Mrs. MCCASKILL (for herself and Mr. BLUNT) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2943, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4591. Mr. REED submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4592. Ms. HIRONO (for herself and Mr. ROUNDS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2943, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4593. Mr. LEE (for himself and Ms. KLOBUCHAR) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4594. Mr. GRAHAM (for himself and Mr. MCCAIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4595. Mr. MCCAIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4229 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill S. 2943, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4596. Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. SANDERS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4597. Mrs. BOXER (for herself, Mrs. SHAHEEN, and Mr. MENENDEZ) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2943, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4598. Mr. SCHUMER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4599. Mr. PORTMAN (for himself and Mr. MURPHY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4600. Mr. CORNYN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4601. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4602. Mr. UDALL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4603. Mr. REID submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 4554. Mr. ISAKSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle I of title X add the following:

SEC. 1097. ADVANCING RESEARCH FOR NEUROLOGICAL DISEASES.

Part P of title III of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280g et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 399S, the following:

"SEC. 399S-1. ADVANCING RESEARCH FOR NEUROLOGICAL DISEASES.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may improve the collection of epidemiological and surveillance data on neurological diseases (including, for purposes of this section, both neurological diseases and neurological conditions), which may include the incorporation of such data into a registry, to facilitate research and improve public health, including, as appropriate, by leveraging existing surveillance activities and registries established under this Act.

''(b) CONTENT.—In carrying out subsection (a), the Secretary—

''(1) shall provide for the collection and storage of information to better describe the incidence and prevalence of neurological diseases in the United States identified under paragraph (2);

''(2) shall initially identify and focus on up to five neurological diseases that available data indicate are the most prevalent or present a significant public health burden;

''(3) shall identify, build upon, leverage, and coordinate among existing data and surveillance systems, surveys, registries, and other existing Federal public health and infrastructure wherever possible;

''(4) shall ensure that any neurological disease surveillance activities conducted pursuant to this section, including any such registry, are designed in a manner that facilitates research on neurological diseases;

''(5) shall, to the extent practicable, provide for the collection and storage of information relevant to the identified neurological diseases, such as—

''(A) demographics, such as age, race, ethnicity, sex, geographic location, and family history, and other information, as appropriate;

''(B) risk factors that may be associated with certain neurological diseases; and

''(C) diagnosis and progression markers;

''(6) may provide for the collection and storage of additional information relevant to analysis on neurological diseases, such as information regarding—

''(A) the natural history of the diseases;

''(B) the prevention, detection, management, and treatments or treatment approaches for the diseases; and

''(C) the development of outcomes measures; and

''(7) may address issues identified during the consultation process described in subsection (c).

''(c) CONSULTATION.—In carrying out this section, the Secretary shall consult with experts, who may include—

''(1) epidemiologists with experience in disease surveillance or registries;

''(2) representatives of national and voluntary health associations that focus on neurological diseases and have demonstrated experience in research, care, or patient services;

''(3) health information technology experts or other information management specialists;

''(4) clinicians with expertise in neurological diseases; and

''(5) research scientists with experience conducting translational research or utilizing surveillance systems or registries for scientific research purposes.

''(d) GRANTS.—The Secretary may award grants to, or enter into contracts or cooperative agreements with, public or private nonprofit entities to carry out activities under this section.

''(e) COORDINATION WITH OTHER FEDERAL AGENCIES.—Consistent with applicable privacy laws, the Secretary shall make information and analysis pertaining to information collected under this section available, as appropriate, to relevant Federal departments and agencies.

''(f) ACCESS FOR BIOMEDICAL RESEARCH.—The Secretary shall make data collected under this section available for purposes of

biomedical research as determined appropriate by the Secretary, to the extent permitted by applicable laws, and in a manner that protects personal privacy.

''(g) REPORTS.—

''(1) INTERIM REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date on which any registry is established and operational under this section, the Secretary shall submit an interim report to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives regarding aggregate information collected pursuant to this section and epidemiological analyses, as appropriate. Such report shall be posted on the Internet website of the Department of Health and Human Services and shall be updated biennially thereafter.

''(2) IMPLEMENTATION REPORT.—Not later than 4 years after the date of the enactment of this section, the Secretary shall submit a report to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives regarding the implementation of this section. Such report shall include information on—

''(A) the development and maintenance of any means of collecting neurological disease surveillance information gathered pursuant to this section;

''(B) the type of information collected and stored;

''(C) the use and availability of such information, including guidelines for such use; and

''(D) the use and coordination of databases that collect or maintain information on neurological diseases.''.

SA 4555. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A title VIII, add the following:

SEC. 807. ENSURING TRANSPARENCY IN ACQUISITION PROGRAMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense shall establish and implement a policy that will ensure the acquisition programs of major systems establish cost, schedule, and performance goals at the onset of the program. The policy shall also ensure that acquisition programs of major systems report on the original cost, schedule, and performance goals throughout the program to ensure transparency.

(b) MAJOR SYSTEM DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''major system'' has the meaning given the term in section 2302d of title 10, United States Code.

SA 4556. Mr. COCHRAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 775, between lines 19 and 20, insert the following:

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on counter-drug activities and activities to counter transnational organized crime under section 384 of title 10, United States Code (as added by subsection (a)). The report shall include the following:

(1) A description of the manner in which counter-drug activities under that section will be coordinated with Governors, the National Guard Bureau, and State law enforcement agencies, including coordination with counterdrug activities conducted under the control of the Governors.

(2) A description of the manner in which notice will be given to Governors on all counter-drug activities and activities to counter transnational organized crime of the Department of Defense under that section that are conducted within the borders of the States.

(3) A description of the manner in which information gathered on and during activities to counter transnational organized crime under that section will be shared with State, local, and tribal authorities and law enforcement agencies.

(4) A description of the manner in which activities under that section will be coordinated with activities under the National Guard Counterdrug Program under section 112 of title 32, United States Code, including mission planning, information analysis, and funding.

(5) A description of the manner in which the National Guard will be integrated into the provision of support to other agencies as described in subsections (a), (b), and (g) of such section 384.

(6) The execution policy of the Department of Defense for section 1206 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 1990 and 1991 (10 U.S.C. 124 note), include a revised definition for the term ''drug-interdiction action'' for purposes of subsection (c) of that section.

(7) In coordination with the Chief of the National Guard Bureau, a description of the manner in which the five regional National Guard Counter-drug Training Centers will be used to provide and supplement valid military training or operations (including training exercises) referred to in subsections (b)(5) and (g) of such section 384, including a description of the savings to be achieved.

SA 4557. Mr. PETERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In the funding table in section 4101, in the item relating to Hi Mob Multi-Purp Whld Veh (HMMWV), strike the amount in the Senate authorized column and insert ''$26,000''.

In the funding table in section 4101, in the item relating to Generators and Associated Equip, strike the amount in the Senate authorized column and insert ''$108,266''.

SA 4558. Mr. BENNET (for himself and Mr. HATCH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title V, add the following:

SEC. 565. STUDY ON CREDIT FOR PRIOR LEARNING OBTAINED THROUGH MILITARY SERVICE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, the Secretary of Education, institutions of higher education, accrediting agencies or associations, State higher education agencies, and veterans service organizations, shall study, and disseminate best practices and information about, processes (including associated costs, methods, and approaches) used by institutions of higher education and other organizations to evaluate or award academic credit for prior learning obtained through military service, including processes, methods, and approaches to ensure academic quality and integrity in evaluating and awarding such credit.

(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to require an institution of higher education to adopt or adhere to a particular process, method, or approach for evaluating or awarding academic credit as a condition for receiving tuition assistance or any other Federal educational benefit provided to servicemembers or students.

SA 4559. Mr. BURR (for himself, Mr. TILLIS, and Mr. NELSON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle I of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1097. REVIEW OF ILLNESSES AND CONDITIONS RELATING TO VETERANS STATIONED AT CAMP LEJEUNE, NORTH CAROLINA AND THEIR FAMILY MEMBERS.

(a) REVIEW AND PUBLICATION OF ILLNESS OR CONDITION.—Part P of title III of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280g et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 399V–6. REVIEW AND PUBLICATION OF ILLNESSES AND CONDITIONS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Consistent with section 104(i) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980, not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this section, and not less frequently than once every 3 years thereafter, the Secretary, acting through the Administrator of the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry, shall—

''(1)(A) review the scientific literature relevant to the relationship between the employment or residence of individuals at Camp Lejeune, North Carolina for not fewer than 30 days during the period beginning on August 1, 1953, and ending on December 21, 1987, and specific illnesses or conditions incurred by those individuals;

''(B) determine each illness or condition for which there is evidence that exposure to a toxic substance at Camp Lejeune, North Carolina, during the period specific in subparagraph (A) may be a cause of the illness or condition; and

''(C) with respect to each illness or condition for which a determination has been

made under subparagraph (B), categorize the evidence of the connection of the illness or condition to exposure described in that subparagraph as—

''(i) sufficient to conclude with reasonable confidence that the exposure is a cause of the illness or condition;

''(ii) modest supporting causation, but not sufficient to conclude with reasonable confidence that exposure is a cause of the illness or condition; or

''(iii) no more than limited supporting causation;

''(2) publish in the Federal Register and on the Internet website of the Department of Health and Human Services—

''(A) a list of each illness or condition for which a determination has been made under paragraph (1)(B), including the categorization of the evidence of causal connection relating to the illness or condition under paragraph (1)(C); and

''(B) the bibliographic citations for all literature reviewed under paragraph (1) for each illness or condition listed under such paragraph; and

''(3) update the list under paragraph (2), as applicable, to add an illness or condition for which a determination has been made under paragraph (1)(B), including the categorization of the evidence of causal connection relating to the illness or condition under paragraph (1)(C), since such list was last updated consistent with the requirements of this subsection.''.

(b) ELIGIBILITY FOR HEALTH CARE FROM DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1710(e)(1)(F) of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by redesignating clauses (i) through (xv) as subclauses (I) through (XV), respectively;

(B) by striking ''(F) Subject to'' and inserting ''(F)(i) Subject to'';

(C) by striking ''any of the following'' and inserting ''any of the illnesses or conditions for which the evidence of connection of the illness or condition to exposure to a toxic substance at Camp Lejeune, North Carolina, during such period is categorized as sufficient or modest in the most recent list published under section 399V–6(a)(2) of the Public Health Service Act, which may include any of the following''; and

(D) by adding at the end the following new clause:

''(ii) For the purposes of ensuring continuation of care, any veteran who has been furnished hospital care or medical services under this subparagraph for an illness or condition shall remain eligible for hospital care or medical services for such illness or condition notwithstanding that the evidence of connection of such illness or condition to exposure to a toxic substance at Camp Lejeune, North Carolina, during the period described in clause (i) is not categorized as sufficient or modest in the most recent list published under section 399V-6(a)(2) of the Public Health Service Act.''.

(2) FAMILY MEMBERS.—Section 1787 of such title is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(c) CONTINUATION OF CARE.—For the purposes of ensuring continuation of care, any individual who has been furnished hospital care or medical services under this section for an illness or condition shall remain eligible for hospital care or medical services for such illness or condition notwithstanding that the illness or condition is no longer described in section 1710(e)(1)(F) of this title.''.

(3) TRANSFER OF AMOUNTS FOR PROGRAM.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, for each of fiscal years 2017 and 2018, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall transfer $2,000,000 from amounts made available to the Department of Veterans Affairs for medical support and compliance to the Chief Business Office and Financial Services Center of the Department to be used to continue building and enhancing the claims processing system, eligibility system, and web portal for the Camp Lejeune Family Member Program of the Department.

SA 4560. Mr. COATS (for himself and Mr. RUBIO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

After section 1243, insert the following:

SEC. 1243A. AUTHORITY FOR MILITARY PERSONNEL OF TAIWAN TO WEAR MILITARY UNIFORMS OF TAIWAN WHILE IN THE UNITED STATES.

Members of the military forces of Taiwan who are wearing an authorized uniform of such military forces in accordance with applicable authorities of Taiwan are hereby authorized to wear such uniforms while in the United States.

SEC. 1243B. GRANT OF OBSERVER STATUS TO THE MILITARY FORCES OF TAIWAN AT RIM OF THE PACIFIC EXERCISES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense shall grant observer status to the military forces of Taiwan in any maritime exercise known as the Rim of the Pacific Exercise.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section takes effect on the date of the enactment of this Act, and applies with respect to any maritime exercise described in subsection (a) that begins on or after such date.

SA 4561. Mr. BARRASSO (for himself, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. DAINES, Mr. ENZI, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. VITTER, Mr. WICKER, Mr. LEE, Mr. CORNYN, and Mr. HATCH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle H of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1277. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ISRAEL AND THE PALESTINIANS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The United States Government has a longstanding position that a peaceful resolution of the conflict between Israel and the Palestinians can only be achieved through direct negotiations between the two parties.

(2) The Palestinians have been pursuing a strategy to seek recognition of a Palestinian state through the United Nations, the United Nations specialized agencies, and the United Nations affiliated organizations.

(3) On March 17, 2016, the ''State of Palestine'' became a party to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) as its 197th member.

(4) Section 414 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1990 and 1991 (Public Law 101–246; 22 U.S.C. 287e note) states the following: ''No funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or any other Act shall be available for the United Nations or any specialized agency thereof which accords the Palestine Liberation Organization the same standing as member states.''

(5) Section 410 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1994 and 1995 (Public Law 103–236; 22 U.S.C. 287e note) states the following: ''The United States shall not make any voluntary or assessed contribution: (1) to any affiliated organization of the United Nations which grants full membership as a state to any organization or group that does not have the internationally recognized attributes of statehood, or (2) to the United Nations, if the United Nations grants full membership as a state in the United Nations to any organization or group that does not have the internationally recognized attributes of statehood, during any period in which such membership is effective.''

(6) The provisions described in paragraphs (4) and (5) may not be waived.

(7) The administration of President Barack Obama has asserted that those provisions do not apply to the UNFCCC because, according to Department of State spokesman John Kirby, ''The UNFCCC is a treaty, and the Palestinians' purported accession does not involve their becoming members of any U.N. specialized agency or, indeed, any international organization.''

(8) Treaties can create international organizations, as demonstrated by the case of the Charter of the United Nations, which is a treaty that created the United Nations organization.

(9) Current United States law often treats entities created by international treaties as international organizations, such as the International Organizations Immunity Act (Public Law 79–291), under which the Executive branch has designated the International Boundary and Water Commission of the United States and Mexico, which was created by United States and Mexico international boundary treaties to assist in their implementation.

(10) The UNFCCC established an international organization based in Bonn, Germany that employs approximately 500 people from over 100 countries and has an annual budget in excess of $60,000,000.

(11) The operating entities of the UNFCCC constitute an ''affiliated organization of the United Nations'' in that the UNFCCC Secretariat is connected and linked to the United Nations in many ways, including the following:

(A) The United Nations Secretary-General appoints the executive secretary of the UNFCCC secretariat.

(B) At the first Conference of the Parties, the UNFCCC decided that its secretariat ''shall be institutionally linked to the United Nations''. According to the UNFCCC website, it remains ''institutionally linked'' today.

(C) The United Nations serves as Depository for the UNFCCC, the Kyoto Protocol, and the Paris Agreement.

(D) The proposed budget of the United Nations for the biennium 2016–2017 supports the UNFCCC.

(E) The United Nations Campus in Bonn, Germany houses the UNFCCC secretariat, which the United Nations lists as one of 18 organizations that represent it and that are part of the ''United Nations presence'' in Bonn.

(F) The UNFCCC secretariat is subject to United Nations rules and regulations regarding procurement and other matters.

(G) The UNFCCC secretariat supports what it describes as the ''largest annual United

Nations conference,'' which is the Conference of Parties.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—Congress—

(1) reaffirms its longstanding position that the only true and lasting path to resolving the Israeli-Palestinian conflict is through direct negotiations between Israel and the Palestinians;

(2) reiterates its strong opposition to any attempt to establish or seek recognition of a Palestinian state outside of an agreement negotiated between leaders in Israel and the Palestinians;

(3) strongly opposes the unilateral actions of the Palestinians to seek statehood recognition through the United Nations, United Nations specialized agencies, United Nations affiliated organizations, and United Nations treaties, conventions, and agreements;

(4) calls on the President to hold the Palestinians accountable for their actions to undermine and circumvent the peace process;

(5) strongly supports the prohibition on United States funding going to any United Nations affiliated organization that grants full membership as a state to any organization or group that does not have the internationally recognized attributes of statehood; and

(6) reaffirms that, under United States law, the United States is prohibited from making any disbursements of United States funds to the UNFCCC secretariat, the Green Climate Fund, the Conference of the Parties, and the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol after the ''State of Palestine'' was allowed to become a full member of the UNFCCC.

SA 4562. Mr. FLAKE (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. CARDIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 1016, strike lines 1 through 4 and insert the following:

(b) EXCEPTION.—The prohibition under subsection (a) shall not apply—

(1) to any joint or multilateral exercise, operation, or related security conference that is related to humanitarian assistance, disaster prevention and response, the security and management of facilities at Guantanamo Bay, freedom of navigation and maritime security, air traffic safety and control, search and rescue, or counter-narcotics;

(2) if the Secretary determines and reports to the appropriate congressional committees that such prohibition is contrary to security interests of the United States or of any of our regional allies; or

(3) to any funding appropriated for a fiscal year other than fiscal year 2017.

SA 4563. Mr. SCOTT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title VIII, add the following:

SEC. 869. DEFINITION OF COMMERCIAL ITEMS.

(a) AMENDMENTS TO DEFINITION.—Section 103 of title 41, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) by striking ''customarily''; and

(ii) by striking ''; and'' and inserting ''; or''; and

(B) in subparagraph (B), by inserting ''is of a type that'' before ''has been sold''; and

(2) in paragraph (3)(B), by inserting '', and the item retains a predominance or preponderance of nongovernmental functions or essential physical characteristics'' after ''requirements''.

(b) RELATIONSHIP TO CERTAIN TITLE 10 PROVISIONS.—This section, and the amendments made by this section, shall not be construed as affecting—

(1) the meaning of the term ''commercial item'' under subsection (a)(5) of section 2464 of title 10, United States Code, or any requirement under subsection (a)(3) or subsection (c) of such section;

(2) the percentage limitation under subsection (a) of section 2466 of such title; or

(3) the definition of ''depot-level maintenance and repair'' under subsection (a) of section 2460 of title 10, United States Code, or the installation of parts as described under subsection (b)(2) of such section.

SA 4564. Mr. CARPER (for himself and Mr. LEAHY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle I of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1097. ACTIVE SHOOTER AND MASS CASUALTY INCIDENT RESPONSE ASSISTANCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Homeland Security, in consultation with the Attorney General and other Federal agencies as appropriate, shall develop and make available to State, local, tribal, territorial, private sector, and nongovernmental partners guidance to assist in the development of response plans for active shooter and mass casualty incidents in publicly accessible spaces, including facilities that have been identified by the Department of Homeland Security as potentially vulnerable targets.

(b) TYPES OF PLANS.—A response plan developed under subsection (a) with respect to a publicly accessible space may include the following elements:

(1) A strategy for evacuating and providing care to persons inside the publicly accessible space, with consideration given to the needs of persons with disabilities.

(2) A plan for establishing a unified command, including identification of staging areas for law enforcement, fire response, and medical personnel.

(3) A schedule for regular testing of equipment used to receive communications during an emergency.

(4) An evaluation of how communications placed by persons inside a publicly accessible space will reach police and other emergency response personnel in an expeditious manner.

(5) A practiced method and plan to communicate with occupants of the publicly accessible space.

(6) A practiced method and plan to communicate with the surrounding community regarding the incident and the needs of Federal, State, and local officials.

(7) A plan for coordinating with volunteer organizations to expedite assistance for victims.

(8) To the extent practicable, a projected maximum time frame for law enforcement response to active shooters, acts of terrorism, and incidents that target the publicly accessible space.

(9) A schedule for joint exercises and training.

SA 4565. Mr. FRANKEN (for himself and Ms. KLOBUCHAR) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title V, add the following:

SEC. 526. CERTAIN BENEFITS IN CONNECTION WITH SERVICE IN THE SELECTED RESERVE FOR PREPLANNED MISSIONS IN SUPPORT OF COMBATANT COMMANDS.

(a) TRICARE BENEFITS BEFORE DEPLOYMENT.—Section 1074(d)(2) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting '', or under section 12304b of this title,'' after ''section 101(a)(13)(B) of this title''.

(b) TRANSITIONAL HEALTH BENEFITS FOLLOWING DEMOBILIZATION.—Section 1145(a)(2) of such title is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(G) A member who is separated from active duty after a period on active duty in excess of 30 days under an order to active duty under section 12304a or 12304b of this title.''.

(c) REDUCED ELIGIBILITY AGE FOR RECEIPT OF NON-REGULAR SERVICE RETIRED PAY.—Section 12731(f)(2)(B) of such title is amended—

(1) by redesignating clauses (iii) and (iv) as clauses (iv) and (v), respectively;

(2) by inserting after clause (ii) the following new clause (iii):

''(iii) Service on active duty described in this subparagraph is also service on active duty after the date of the enactment of this clause under an order to active duty under section 12304b of this title.''; and

(3) in clause (iv), as redesignated by paragraph (1), by inserting ''or (iii)'' after ''or in clause (ii)''.

(d) POST-9/11 EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE.—Section 3301(1)(B) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking ''12302, or 12304'' and inserting ''12302, 12304, or 12304b''.

(e) RETROACTIVE EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on December 31, 2011.

SA 4566. Ms. HIRONO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2943, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title XVI, add the following:

SEC. 1622. MARITIME INTELLIGENCE, SURVEILLANCE, AND RECONNAISSANCE CAPABILITIES FOR THE NAVY.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The Navy is on the verge of deploying the Triton unmanned aircraft system (UAS) to the fleet.

(2) The Triton system performs maritime intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (ISR) missions.

(3) The Air Force has already deployed a number of Global Hawk remotely piloted aircraft (RPA), from which the Triton system is derived.

(4) The Navy should acquire maritime intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance capabilities in an economical manner.

(5) If the Navy determines that the maritime intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance capabilities currently planned for the Triton system at initial operating capability are not sufficient to meet its emerging needs for such capabilities, the Navy should consider using off-the-shelf technologies to fill such needs.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Navy shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report setting forth the following:

(1) An assessment of emerging threats for which maritime intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance capabilities are a requirement.

(2) A description of the plans of the Navy plans to obtain such capabilities to address that requirement.

SA 4567. Ms. BALDWIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2943, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 5102 and insert the following:

SEC. 5102. CLARIFICATION OF PERSONS SUBJECT TO UCMJ WHILE ON INACTIVE-DUTY TRAINING.

Paragraph (3) of section 802(a) of title 10, United States Code (article 2(a) of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), is amended to read as follows:

''(3)(A) Members of the Army National Guard of the United States and the Air National Guard of the United States, but only when serving on active duty.

''(B) Members of a reserve component, other than the Army National Guard of the United States or the Air National Guard of the Unites States, while on inactive-duty training and during any of the periods specified in subparagraph (C).

''(C) The periods referred to in subparagraph (B) are the following:

''(i) Travel to and from the inactive-duty training site of the member, pursuant to orders or regulations.

''(ii) Intervals between consecutive periods of inactive-duty training on the same day, pursuant to orders or regulations.

''(iii) Intervals between inactive-duty training on consecutive days, pursuant to orders or regulations.''.

SA 4568. Mrs. MURRAY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2943, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle I of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1097. BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING AND CERTAIN FEDERAL BENEFITS.

(a) EXCLUSION.—Section 403(k) of title 37, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(4) In determining eligibility to participate in the supplemental nutrition assistance program established under the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2011 et seq.) and the Family Subsistence Supplemental Allowance program, the value of a housing allowance under this section shall be excluded from any calculation of income, assets, or resources.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 5(d) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2014(d)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (18), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in paragraph (19)(B), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(20) any allowance described in section 403(k)(4) of title 37, United States Code.''.

SA 4569. Mrs. MURRAY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2943, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 445, strike lines 1 through 8 and insert the following:

SEC. 757. REIMBURSEMENT BY DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE TO ENTITIES CARRYING OUT STATE VACCINATION PROGRAMS FOR COSTS OF VACCINES PROVIDED TO COVERED BENEFICIARIES.

(a) REIMBURSEMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense shall reimburse an amount determined under para-

---

SA 4570. Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title V, add the following:

SEC. 538. MODIFICATION OF DISCRETIONARY AUTHORITY TO AUTHORIZE CERTAIN ENLISTMENTS IN THE ARMED FORCES.

Section 504(b)(2) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking ''if the Secretary'' and all that follows and inserting ''if—

''(A) the person is an alien who was inspected and admitted at the time of entry into the United States, has been in a lawful immigration status (except temporary protected status under section 244 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1254a)) continually for a period of at least five years since the time of admission, and has not violated any of the terms or conditions of such status; and

''(B) the Secretary determines that such enlistment is vital to the national interest.''.

SA 4571. Mr. MORAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title XXVIII, insert the following:

SEC. 28____. ENVIRONMENTAL REMEDIATION, EXPLOSIVES CLEANUP, AND SITE RESTORATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—As part of any land conveyance by the Army to a public or private entity, the Secretary of the Army shall carry out under section 2701 of title 10, United States Code, the activities described in subsection (b).

(b) ENVIRONMENTAL REMEDIATION, EXPLOSIVES CLEANUP, AND SITE RESTORATION ACTIVITIES.—The activities described in this subsection are—

(1) environmental remediation activities, including—

(A) any corrective action required under a permit issued by the State in which the property is located pursuant to the Solid Waste Disposal Act (42 U.S.C. 6901 et seq.) relating to the property;

(B) any activity to be carried out by the entity pursuant to a consent agreement (including any amendments) between the entity and the State in which the property is located regarding Army activities at the property;

(C) the abatement of any potential explosive and ordnance conditions on the property;

(D) the demolition, abatement, removal, and disposal of any structure containing asbestos and lead-based paint, including the foundations, footing, and slabs of the structure, together with backfilling and seeding;

(E) the removal and disposal of any soil that contains a quantity of pesticide in excess of the standard of the State in which the property is located, together with backfilling and seeding;

(F) the design, construction, closure, and post-closure of any solid waste landfill facility permitted by the State in which the property is located pursuant to the delegated authority of the State under the Solid Waste Disposal Act (42 U.S.C. 6901 et seq.) to accommodate the consolidation of any existing landfills on the property and future requirements;

(G) lime sludge removal, disposal, and backfilling relating to any water treatment plant;

(H) the closure of any septic tank on the property; and

(I) any financial assurance required in connection with the activities described in this paragraph; and

(2) site restoration activities, including—

(A) the collection and disposal of any solid waste that was present on the property before the date on which the Army conveys the land to the entity;

(B) the removal of any improvement to the property that was present on the property before the date on which the Army conveys the land to the entity, including roads, sewers, gas lines, poles, ballast, structures, slabs, footings, and foundations, together with backfilling and seeding;

(C) any impediments to redevelopment of the property arising from the use of the property by, or on behalf of, the Army or any contractor of the Army;

(D) any financial assurance required in connection with the activities described in this paragraph; and

(E) payment of the legal, environmental, and engineering costs incurred by the entity for the analysis of the work necessary to complete the environmental remediation.

SA 4572. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title V, add the following:

SEC. 565. CONSOLIDATION OF FINANCIAL LITERACY PROGRAMS AND TRAINING FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) PLAN REQUIRED.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report setting forth a plan for the consolidation of the current financial literacy training programs of the Department of Defense and the military departments for members of the Armed Forces into ''a coordinated and comprehensive'' program of financial literacy training for members that—

(1) eliminates duplication and costs in the provision of financial literacy training to members; and

(2) ensures that members receive effective training in financial literacy in as few training sessions as is necessary for the receipt of effective training.

(b) IMPLEMENTATION.—The Secretary of Defense and the Secretaries of the military departments shall commence implementation of the plan required by subsection (a) 90 days after the date of the submittal of the plan as required by that subsection.

SA 4573. Ms. HEITKAMP submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2943, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 809, after line 24, add the following:

(5) a description of installations from which the Armed Forces may conduct communications and domain awareness activities in support of Arctic security missions; and

(6) a description of efforts to promote military-to-military cooperation with partner countries that have mutual security interests in the Arctic region, including opportunities for sharing installations and maintenance facilities to enhance domain awareness in the Arctic region.

On page 810, between lines 16 and 17, insert the following:

(f) OTHER INSTALLATIONS.—Nothing in this section may be construed to limit the authority of the Department of Defense to use existing infrastructure in support of Arctic domain awareness or to pursue military-to-military cooperation with partner countries that have mutual security interests in the Arctic region, including opportunities for sharing installations and maintenance facilities to enhance domain awareness in the Arctic region.

SA 4574. Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. COONS, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. SANDERS, and Mr. BOOKER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle I of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1097. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING THE NEED TO ADDRESS THE NATIONAL SECURITY IMPLICATIONS OF CLIMATE CHANGE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) the 2014 Quadrennial Defense Review concluded that—

(A) ''[t]he impacts of climate change may increase the frequency, scale, and complexity of future missions, including defense support to civil authorities, while at the same time undermining the capacity of our domestic installations to support training activities''; and

(B) the effects of climate change on severe weather, sea levels, and availability of fresh water represent ''threat multipliers that will aggravate stressors abroad such as poverty, environmental degradation, political instability, and social tensions – conditions that can enable terrorist activity and other forms of violence'';

(2) in the foreword to the 2014 Department of Defense Climate Change Adaptation Roadmap, former Secretary of Defense Chuck Hagel wrote that climate change ''has the potential to exacerbate many of the challenges we are dealing with today – from infectious disease to terrorism. . . . Rising global temperatures, changing precipitation patterns, climbing sea levels, and more extreme weather events will intensify the challenges of global instability, hunger, poverty, and conflict'';

(3) the 2014 Climate Change Adaptation Roadmap—

(A) found that the effects of climate change could cause instability around the world ''by impairing access to food and water, damaging infrastructure, spreading disease, uprooting and displacing large numbers of people, compelling mass migration, interrupting commercial activity, or restricting electricity availability''; and

(B) judged that ''these developments could undermine already-fragile governments that are unable to respond effectively or challenge currently-stable governments, as well as increasing competition and tension between countries vying for limited resources'';

(4) the 2015 National Security Strategy states that ''climate change is an urgent and growing threat to our national security, contributing to increased natural disasters, refugee flows, and conflicts over basic resources like food and water'';

(5) the 2015 Quadrennial Diplomacy and Development Review asserts that ''climate change exacerbates our greatest vulnerabilities'';

(6) the 2013 Department of Homeland Security Climate Action Plan notes that—

(A) some weather effects related to climate change, such as warmer temperatures and increasingly severe storms, ''may cause damage or disruptions to telecommunications and power systems, creating challenges for telecommunications infrastructure, emergency communications, and cybersecurity'';

(B) ''more extreme weather conditions in parts of the world with limited ability to provide state aid create opportunities for militant groups to become active in their communities''; and

(C) ''[c]limate change acts as a 'threat multiplier,' aggravating stressors abroad such as poverty, environmental degradation, and social tensions, resulting in conditions that could enable terrorist activity and violence'';

(7) in February 2016, the Director of National Intelligence, James Clapper, testified before the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate that—

(A) ''[e]xtreme weather, climate change, environmental degradation, related rising demand for food and water, poor policy responses, and inadequate critical infrastructure will probably exacerbate—and potentially spark—political instability, adverse health conditions, and humanitarian crises in 2016''; and

(B) ''[s]everal of these developments, especially those in the Middle East, suggest that environmental degradation might become a more common source for interstate tensions'';

(8) Department of Defense Directive 4715.21 entitled ''Climate Change Adaptation and Resilience'' and promulgated in January 2016 states that—

(A) as a matter of policy, the Department of Defense ''must be able to adapt current and future operations to address the impacts of climate change in order to maintain an effective and efficient U.S. military''; and

(B) all Department of Defense mission planning and execution must—

(i) include ''identification and assessment of the effects of climate change on the DoD mission'';

(ii) take ''those effects into consideration when developing plans and implementing procedures''; and

(iii) anticipate and manage ''any risks that develop as a result of climate change to build resilience'';

(9) in the 2015 report to Congress entitled ''National Security Implications of Climate-Related Risks and a Changing Climate'', the Secretary of Defense—

(A) acknowledged ''the reality of climate change and the significant risk it poses to U.S. interests globally''; and

(B) recognized that—

(i) ''[a] changing climate increases the risk of instability and conflict overseas, and has implications for DoD on operations, personnel, installations, and the stability, development, and human security of other nations''; and

(ii) ''[g]lobal climate change will have wide-ranging implications for U.S. national security interests over the foreseeable future because it will aggravate existing problems—such as poverty, social tensions, environmental degradation, ineffectual leadership, and weak political institutions—that threaten domestic stability in a number of countries''; and

(10) leading United States national security experts from both major political parties, including 12 former Senators and Representatives, 10 retired generals and admirals, the Chair and the Vice Chair of the National Commission on Terrorist Attacks Upon the United States (commonly referred to as the ''9/11 Commission''), and Cabinet and Cabinet-level officials from the Carter, Reagan, George H. W. Bush, Clinton, George

W. Bush, and Obama Administrations, signed an open letter in October 2015, stating that climate change ''is critically important to the world's most experienced security planners. The impacts are real, and the costs of inaction are unacceptable. America's elected leaders and private sector must think past tomorrow to focus on this growing problem, and take action at home and abroad.''.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that it is in the national security interests of the United States to assess, plan for, and mitigate the security and strategic implications of climate change.

SA 4575. Mr. MCCAIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle H of title VIII, add the following:

SEC. 899C. IMPROVED DEFENSE COOPERATION AND ACCESS TO COMMERCIAL INNOVATION.

(a) COMPETITIVE PRICING DISCRETION IN FOREIGN MILITARY SALES CONTRACTING.—Section 22(d)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2762(d)(1)) is amended by striking ''shall'' and inserting ''may, at the discretion of the Secretary of Defense,''.

(b) COMMERCIAL ITEM ITAR EXEMPTION.—Any commercial item as defined in section 103 of title 41, United States Code, that is incorporated in a defense product shall be regulated under the Export Administration Regulations (part 730 of title 15, Code of Federal Regulations) and exempt from regulation under the International Traffic in Arms Regulations (subchapter M of chapter I of title 22, Code of Federal Regulations) unless the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of State makes a written determination prior to incorporation of the commercial item in the defense product that the International Traffic in Arms Regulations should apply.

(c) POST-EXPORT SUPPLY CHAIN TRANSFERS WITHIN NATIONAL TECHNOLOGY INDUSTRIAL BASE COUNTRIES.—The government of a country that is part of the national technology industrial base (as that term is defined in section 2500 of title 10, United States Code) may transfer United States-origin material within that government's supply chain without further United States Government approval or the need to comply with additional export licensing requirements provided that the material remains in the ownership of such government.

(d) INTEGRATION OF SUPPLY CHAIN WITHIN NATIONAL TECHNOLOGY INDUSTRIAL BASE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—A company included on the list under paragraph (2) with facilities in both the United States and in a country that is part of the national technology industrial base (as that term is defined in section 2500 of title 10, United States Code) may transfer controlled material between a United States facility and a facility located in a national technology industrial base country without the need for United States Government approval or the need for an additional export control license. Any such transfer must comply with United States security classification requirements.

(2) APPROVED COMPANY LIST.—The list referred to in paragraph (1) is a list maintained by the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State of companies the Secretaries have determined are qualified for the streamlined transfer authority under such paragraph.

(e) NON-MISSILE TECHNOLOGY EXPORTS.—Export control policies, procedures, and practices specific to implementing the Missile Technology Control Regime shall not apply to the review and approval of exports of non-missile technologies such as unmanned autonomous vehicles, optionally piloted vehicles, and commercial space craft.

(f) IMPLEMENTATION OF TREATIES ON DEFENSE COOPERATION.—The Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense shall conduct a review of the exempted technologies lists that apply to the Treaty Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Australia Concerning Defense Trade Cooperation, done at Sydney September 5, 2007, and the Treaty Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland Concerning Defense Trade Cooperation, done at Washington and London June 21 and 26, 2007, with the aim of reducing the applicable lists to the minimum compatible with international obligations.

(g) ENHANCING PROGRAM LICENSING.—Not later than September 30, 2018, the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State shall establish a structure for implementing a revised program export licensing framework intended to provide comprehensive export licensing authorization to support large international cooperative defense programs between multiple nations and determine what, if any, regulatory authorities require modification.

SA 4576. Mr. TILLIS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 337, line 5, insert before the semicolon the following: '', except in the case of a pharmaceutical agent prescribed to a patient for which the prescribing health care provider determines that such agent is medically necessary for the patient and receives a waiver from the Secretary to prescribe such agent to the patient under a process that the Secretary shall establish for such purpose''.

SA 4577. Mr. SCHATZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title XXVIII, add the following:

SEC. 2814. DURATION OF ENERGY SAVINGS CONTRACTS.

Section 2913 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsections:

''(e) DURATION OF CONTRACTS.—An energy savings contract entered into under this section may have a contract period not to exceed 25 years.

''(f) VERIFICATION REQUIREMENTS.—The conditions of an energy savings contract entered into under this section shall include requirements for measurement, verification, and performance assurances or guarantees of the savings.''.

SA 4578. Ms. HIRONO (for herself and Mr. CORNYN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2943, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title XI, add the following:

SEC. 1114. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON BUSINESS CASES ANALYSES FOR DECISIONS AFFECTING THE WORKFORCE AND MODIFYING LOCATIONS OF WHERE WORK WILL BE EXECUTED OR COMPLETED.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) in a budget constrained environment, the military departments and Defense Agencies must utilize all available tools to make informed, supportable decisions in moving workforce and workload from one location or entity to another;

(2) such tools should include a properly supported and documented business case analysis (BCA);

(3) before a military department or Defense Agency embarks on a workforce decision of workload in excess of $3,000,000 per year, the Department of Defense needs to understand the possible costs, benefits, risks, and impacts to the small business goals, small and disadvantaged contracting agreements, and other sensitivities of the Department associated with such a decision;

(4) the military departments and Defense Agencies should perform a business case analysis, as part of any workforce decision described in paragraph (3);

(5) any such business case analysis for a workforce decision having an annual estimated cost of $5,000,0000 or more should be reviewed and approved by the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, and the Under Secretary should provide such business case analysis to the congressional defense committees at least 30 days before taking any action to effect a shift in the workload concerned;

(6) the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Logistics, Materiel, and Readiness, working with the Cost Analysis Program Evaluation office, should develop minimum standards and criteria for business case analyses covered by this section and a process for the review and transparency of such business case analyses; and

(7) the Assistant Secretary should submit to the congressional defense committees, by not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, a report on the plan of the Assistant Secretary plan to implement the standards and criteria described in paragraph (6).

(b) BUSINESS CASE ANALYSIS DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''business case analysis'' means a structured methodology and decision support document that aids decision making by identifying and comparing alternatives by examining the mission and business impacts (both financial and non-financial), risks, and sensitivities.

SA 4579. Mr. BENNET submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by

him to the bill S. 2943, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title IX, add the following:

SEC. 926. PROHIBITION ON CONSOLIDATION OF UNITED STATES NORTHERN COMMAND WITH ANY OTHER GEOGRAPHIC COMBATANT COMMAND.

No amounts authorized to be appropriated by this Act, or amounts authorized to be appropriated for the Department of Defense for a fiscal year before fiscal year 2017 that remain available for obligation, may be used as follows:

(1) To consolidate the United States Northern Command with any other geographic combatant command.

(2) To subordinate the United States Northern Command to any other geographic combatant command.

SA 4580. Mr. CASSIDY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle I of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1097. PROVISION OF ACCESS BY EMPLOYEES OF MEMBERS OF CONGRESS TO CASE-TRACKING INFORMATION TO CASE-TRACKING INFORMATION OF DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 59 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''§ 5906. Provision of access by employees of members of Congress to case-tracking information

''(a) IN GENERAL.—(1) Beginning not later than the date that is 180 days after the date of the enactment of this section, the Secretary shall provide to accredited, permanent Congressional employees who have successfully completed the certification process described in subsection (b)(1), upon election by the Member of Congress for which the employee works, read-only remote access to the electronic VBA claims records system of veterans who reside in the area represented by the Member, regardless of whether such employee is acting under a power of attorney executed by such veteran.

''(2) The Secretary shall ensure that access provided to an accredited, permanent Congressional employee under paragraph (1) is provided in a manner that does not allow the employee to modify the data contained in the electronic VBA claims records system.

''(b) CERTIFICATION REQUIRED.—(1) The certification process described in this paragraph is the certification process that the Secretary requires an agent or attorney under this chapter to complete before the agent or attorney may access the electronic VBA claims records system.

''(2) Each Member of Congress who elects to have an accredited, permanent Congressional employee of the Member have access under subsection (a)(1) shall bear the cost of the certification process described in paragraph (1), to be paid from the Member's Representational Allowance.

''(c) TREATMENT OF DISCLOSURE.—The access to information by an accredited, permanent Congressional employee pursuant to subsection (a)(1) shall be deemed to be—

''(1) a disclosure permitted under section 552a(b) of title 5; and

''(2) a disclosure permitted under regulations promulgated under section 264(c) of the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 (Public Law 104–191; 42 U.S.C. 1320d–2 note).

''(d) NONRECOGNITION.—The Secretary may not recognize an accredited, permanent Congressional employee for the preparation, presentation, and prosecution of claims under laws administered by the Secretary by reason of the Secretary providing the employee with access to the electronic VBA claims records system under subsection (a). An accredited, permanent Congressional employee who is provided such access may not use such access to act as such a recognized individual.

''(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) The term 'electronic VBA claims records system' means the system of the Department of Veterans Affairs that provides information regarding the status of a claim submitted by a veteran, including information regarding medical records, compensation and pension exams records, rating decisions, statement of the case (SOC), supplementary statement of the case (SSOC), notice of disagreement (NOD), and Form–9.

''(2) The term 'accredited, permanent Congressional employee' means an employee of a Member of Congress who assists the constituents of the Member with issues regarding departments or agencies of the Federal Government.

''(3) The term 'Member of Congress' means a Representative, a Senator, a Delegate to Congress, or the Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 59 of such title is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''5906. Provision of access by employees of members of Congress to case-tracking information.''.

SA 4581. Mr. SULLIVAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 1049, strike lines 14 through 16 and insert the following:

through the program, and the specific military operations conducted.

(4) Each partner country or ally, if any, included in the military operations.

(c) FORM.—Each report under this section shall be submitted in unclassified form.

SEC. 1241A. UNITED STATES POLICY WITH RESPECT TO FREEDOM OF NAVIGATION OPERATIONS AND OVERFLIGHT BEYOND THE TERRITORIAL SEA.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Since the Declaration of Independence in 1776, which was inspired in part as a response to a ''tyrant'' who ''plundered our seas, ravaged our Coasts'' and who wrote laws ''for cutting off our Trade with all parts of the world'', freedom of seas and promotion of international commerce have been core security interests of the United States.

(2) Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States establishes enumerated powers for Congress which include regulating commerce with foreign nations, punishing piracies and felonies committed on the high seas and offenses against the law of nations, and providing and maintaining a Navy.

(3) For centuries, the United States has maintained a bedrock commitment to ensuring the right to freedom of navigation for all law-abiding parties in every region of the world.

(4) In support of international law, the longstanding United States commitment to freedom of navigation and ensuring the free access to sea lanes to promote global commerce remains a core security interest of the United States.

(5) This is particularly true in areas of the world that are critical transportation corridors and key routes for global commerce, such as the South China Sea and the East China Sea, through which a significant portion of global commerce transits.

(6) The consistent exercise of freedom of navigation operations and overflights by United States naval and air forces throughout the world plays a critical role in safeguarding the freedom of the seas for all lawful nations, supporting international law, and ensuring the continued safe passage and promotion of global commerce and trade.

(b) DECLARATION OF POLICY.—It is the policy of the United States to fly, sail, and operate throughout the oceans, seas, and airspace of the world wherever international law allows.

(c) IMPLEMENTATION OF POLICY.—In furtherance of the policy set forth in subsection (b), the Secretary of Defense shall—

(1) plan and execute a robust series of routine and regular naval presence missions and freedom of navigation operations (FONOPs) throughout the world, with a particular emphasis on critical transportation corridors and key routes for global commerce (such as the South China Sea and the East China Sea);

(2) execute, in such critical transportation corridors, routine and regular naval presence missions and maritime freedom of navigation operations throughout the year;

(3) give preference in freedom of navigation operations to unlawful or excessive maritime coastal state claims that have not been challenged within the past three years;

(4) in addition to the operations executed pursuant to paragraph (2), execute routine and regular maritime freedom of navigation operations throughout the year, in accordance with international law, including the use of expanded military options and maneuvers beyond innocent passage (including operating under normal military conditions inside 12 nautical miles of features determined to be low-tide elevations); and

(5) to the maximum extent practicable, execute freedom of navigation operations pursuant to this subsection with regional partner countries and allies of the United States.

SA 4582. Ms. HIRONO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2943, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title V, add the following:

SEC. 590. REVIEW REGARDING AWARD OF MEDAL OF HONOR TO CERTAIN ASIAN AMERICAN AND NATIVE AMERICAN PACIFIC ISLANDER WAR VETERANS.

(a) REVIEW REQUIRED.—The Secretary of each military department shall review the service records of each Asian American and Native American Pacific Islander war veteran described in subsection (b) to determine whether that veteran should be awarded the Medal of Honor.

(b) COVERED VETERANS.—The Asian American and Native American Pacific Islander war veterans whose service records are to be reviewed under subsection (a) are the following:

(1) Any Asian American or Native American Pacific Islander war veteran who was awarded the Distinguished-Service Cross, the Navy Cross, or the Air Force Cross during the Korean War or the Vietnam War.

(2) Any other Asian American or Native American Pacific Islander war veteran whose name is submitted to the Secretary concerned for such purpose before the end of the one-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) CONSULTATIONS.—In carrying out the review under subsection (a), the Secretary of each military department shall consult with such veterans service organizations as the Secretary considers appropriate.

(d) RECOMMENDATIONS BASED ON REVIEW.—If the Secretary concerned determines, based upon the review under subsection (a) of the service records of any Asian American or Native American Pacific Islander war veteran, that the award of the Medal of Honor to that veteran is warranted, the Secretary shall submit to the President a recommendation that the President award the Medal of Honor to that veteran.

(e) AUTHORITY TO AWARD MEDAL OF HONOR.—A Medal of Honor may be awarded to an Asian American or Native American Pacific Islander war veteran in accordance with a recommendation of the Secretary concerned under subsection (d).

(f) CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION.—No Medal of Honor may be awarded pursuant to subsection (e) until the Secretary of Defense submits to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives notice of the recommendations under subsection (d), including the name of each Asian American or Native American Pacific Islander war veteran recommended to be awarded a Medal of Honor and the rationale for such recommendation.

(g) WAIVER OF TIME LIMITATIONS.—An award of the Medal of Honor may be made under subsection (e) without regard to—

(1) section 3744, 6248, or 8744 of title 10, United States Code, as applicable; and

(2) any regulation or other administrative restriction on—

(A) the time for awarding the Medal of Honor; or

(B) the awarding of the Medal of Honor for service for which a Distinguished-Service Cross, Navy Cross, or Air Force Cross has been awarded.

(h) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ''Native American Pacific Islander'' means a Native Hawaiian or Native American Pacific Islander, as those terms are defined in section 815 of the Native American Programs Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 2992c).

SA 4583. Mr. REID (for Mr. WARNER (for himself and Mr. BLUNT)) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. REID to the bill S. 2943, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle F of title V, add the following:

SEC. 582. REPORT ON PLAN FOR STAFFING AND OPERATION OF THE ARMY CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER, SPRINGFIELD, VIRGINIA.

Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall, in consultation with the Secretary of the Army, submit to the congressional defense committees a report setting forth a plan to ensure appropriate staffing and operation of the Army Child Development Center adjacent to the campus of the National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency in Springfield, Virginia.

SA 4584. Mr. TESTER (for himself and Mr. ROUNDS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle F of title V, add the following:

SEC. 583. GAO REPORT ON IMPACT AID CONSTRUCTION PROGRAMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a comprehensive study that—

(1) examines the implementation of section 8007 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (for fiscal year 2016 and any preceding fiscal year, and as in effect for such fiscal year) and section 7007 of that Act (for each of fiscal years 2017 and 2018, and as in effect for such fiscal year), including a comparison of—

(A) the distribution of payments between subparagraphs (A) and (B) of subsection (a)(3) of those sections, as applicable, for the period of the 10 fiscal years preceding the fiscal year of the study;

(B) other Federal construction or capital funding made available to local educational agencies eligible to receive funding under subsection (a)(3) of those sections; and

(C) the overall level of available capital funding, and estimated bonding capacity, of local educational agencies eligible to receive funding under subsection (a)(3) of those sections compared to national recommended average investments and other comparable local educational agencies;

(2) evaluates unmet need as of the date of enactment of this section for housing of professionals employed to work at schools operated by local educational agencies eligible to receive funding under subsection (a)(3)(B) of section 7007 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (as in effect for fiscal year 2017);

(3) to the extent practicable, determines the age, condition, and remaining utility of school facilities for those local educational agencies eligible under section 7007(a)(3) of that Act (as in effect for fiscal year 2017) that are eligible to receive a basic support payment under—

(A) section 8003(b) of that Act (for any of fiscal years 2009 through 2016, and as in effect for such fiscal year); and

(B) section 7003(b) of that Act (for any of fiscal years 2017 and 2018, and as in effect for such fiscal year); and

(4) recommends a method by which the Federal Government may develop a school facility condition index for a school facility of a local educational agency eligible to receive funding under 7007(a)(3) of that Act (as in effect for fiscal year 2017) that limits the reporting burden to the maximum extent practicable on the eligible local educational agencies included in the index.

(b) REPORTING.—The Comptroller General shall submit a report containing the conclusions of the study under subsection (a) to—

(1) the Committees on Indian Affairs, Armed Services, and Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate; and

(2) the Subcommittee on Indian, Insular, and Alaska Native Affairs and the Committees on Education and the Workforce and Armed Services of the House of Representatives.

(c) TIMEFRAME.—The Comptroller General shall complete the study under subsection (a) and submit the report under subsection (b) by the date that is not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act.

(d) DEFINITION OF SCHOOL FACILITY.—In this section, the term ''school facility'' has the meaning given the term in section 7013 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7713), as in effect for fiscal year 2017.

SA 4585. Mr. CORNYN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1224. SALE OF MULTIROLE FIGHTER AIRCRAFT TO BAHRAIN.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Actions taken by the Administration have unduly delayed the export of multirole fighter aircraft to Bahrain.

(2) Continued defense security cooperation and assistance with Bahrain are critical to regional security and countering the terrorist group the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria (ISIS), as well as counterbalancing the influence of Iran and its proxies in the region.

(3) Bahrain has made several of its military facilities available for use by the United States military to address past and current threats from Iraq, Iran, Afghanistan, international terrorism, and piracy and smuggling in the Gulf and Arabian Sea.

(4) Outdated Bahraini F–16 aircraft lack certain capabilities, and this limits their utility in coalition operations.

(5) For several years, Bahrain has expressed interest in upgrading its existing fleet of 20 F–16 Block 40 aircraft with advanced capabilities, including Active Electronically Scanned Array radars.

(6) Bahrain submitted formal Letters of Request for these upgrades, as well as for the sale of a comparable number of new F–16 aircraft in November 2015.

(7) The upgrade and sale of F–16 aircraft to Bahrain will help advance military-to-military cooperation between the United States and Bahrain.

(8) Recent inroads by European and Russian manufacturers of competitor aircraft in

the region have the potential to erode United States military-to-military relations with Bahrain, and these potential erosions deepen regional concerns over United States policy in the Middle East generally and towards Iran specifically.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) a strong bilateral relationship between the United States and Bahrain is critical to maintaining stability in the Middle East, countering the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria, mitigating further terrorist threats, and counterbalancing Iran and its regional proxies;

(2) Bahrain and the United States share a mutual commitment to regional security, counterterrorism efforts, and related coalition operations; and

(3) the Bahraini air force needs additional advanced multirole fighter aircraft in order to modernize its fleet and participate in regional security initiatives and counter-Islamic State of Iraq and Syria campaigns.

(c) SALE OF MULTIROLE FIGHTER AIRCRAFT.—The President shall carry out the sale of all pending foreign military sales of F–16 fighter aircraft and related upgrades of existing F–16 aircraft to Bahrain by not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SA 4586. Mr. HELLER (for himself, Mr. REID, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle I of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1097. COMMERCIAL GAMING NOT LOCATED ON INDIAN LAND.

(a) PURPOSE.—The purpose of the amendment made by subsection (b) is to ensure that the rights, processes, and provisions of the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (25 U.S.C. 2701 et seq.) are used exclusively to provide for the regulation of noncommercial gaming by Indian tribes on Indian lands (as those terms are defined in section 4 of that Act (25 U.S.C. 2703)).

(b) COMMERCIAL GAMING.—Section 11(d)(8) of the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (25 U.S.C. 2710(d)(8)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraphs (C) and (D) as subparagraphs (D) and (E), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subparagraph (B) the following:

''(C)(i) Notwithstanding subparagraph (B), the Secretary shall disapprove a compact, or an amendment to a compact, described in subparagraph (A) if the compact or amendment authorizes, approves, or aids, directly or indirectly, in the authorization or approval of a commercial gaming activity—

''(I) not located on Indian lands; and

''(II) that is or would be owned or operated, directly or indirectly, by 1 or more Indian tribes.

''(ii) A compact or an amendment to a compact disapproved under clause (i) shall not take effect.''.

SA 4587. Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Mr. MCCAIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2943, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title XI, add the following:

SEC. 1114. PILOT PROGRAM ON APPOINTMENT OF PHYSICALLY DISQUALIFIED FORMER CADETS AND MIDSHIPMEN IN THE EXCEPTED SERVICE.

(a) PILOT PROGRAMS AUTHORIZED.—Each Secretary of a military department may carry out a pilot program to assess the feasability and advisability of appointing in the excepted service former cadets or midshipmen who—

(1) graduated from a military service academy or a Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps (ROTC) program; and

(2) are medically disqualified for appointment as a commissioned officer and fulfilling an active duty service obligation arising from participation of such cadets or midshipmen at such academy or through such a program.

(b) EMPLOYMENT.—Under a pilot program, the Secretary of the military department concerned—

(1) may, without regard to any provision of title 5, United States Code, governing appointment of employees to competitive service positions within the Department of Defense, appoint to a position within the Department in the excepted service an individual who meets the eligibility criteria of subsection (c); and

(2) may, upon satisfactory completion of two years of substantially continuous service by an incumbent who was appointed to an excepted service position under the authority of paragraph (1), convert the appointment of such individual, without competition, to a career or career conditional appointment.

(c) ELIGIBILITY.—A former cadet or midshipman is eligible for appointment under a pilot program only if—

(1) the former cadet or midshipman was previously under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the military department concerned;

(2) the former cadet or midshipman completed the prescribed course of instruction and graduated from a military service academy or a Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps program;

(3) the former cadet or midshipman is determined to be medically disqualified to complete a period of active duty prescribed in an agreement signed by such cadet or midshipman in accordance with section 4348, 6959, 9348, or 2107 of title 10, United States Code, as applicable; and

(4) the medical disqualification is not the result of the gross negligence or misconduct of the cadet or midshipman.

(d) RELATIONSHIP TO REPAYMENT PROVISIONS.—

(1) SATISFACTION OF OBLIGATION.—A former cadet or midshipman shall be treated as relieved of any repayment obligation under section 303a(e) or 373 of title 37, United States Code, in connection with the failure of the cadet or midshipman to accept appointment as a commissioned officer and fulfill an active duty service obligation as described in subsection (a) by the either of the following:

(A) Service in the excepted service under the pilot program for such period as the Secretary of the military department concerned shall specify at the time of the appointment of the former cadet or midshipman under the pilot program.

(B) The competition of the cadet or midshipman for, and the encumbrance of the cadet or midshipman of, a permanent position within the Department or one of its components.

(2) COERCION PROHIBITED.—A Secretary of a military department shall not implicitly or explicitly compel an individual described in subsection (c) to accept an appointment in the excepted service under this section.

(e) RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to—

(1) authorize additional positions or create any vacancies to which eligible individuals may be appointed; or

(2) except as provided in subsection (d)(1), alter the authority of a Secretary authority under section 303a(e)(1), 373(b), or 374 of title 37, United States Code.

(f) TERMINATION OF AUTHORITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The authority to make appointment in the excepted service under a pilot program shall expire on the date that is four years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) EFFECT ON EXISTING APPOINTMENTS.—The termination by paragraph (1) of the authority in subsection (a) shall not affect any appointment made under that authority before the termination date specified in paragraph (1) in accordance with the terms of such appointment.

SA 4588. Mr. BOOZMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title V, add the following:

SEC. 565. REPORT ON EVALUATION AND OVERSIGHT OF THE SENIOR RESERVE OFFICERS' TRAINING CORPS PROGRAMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of the Act, the Secretary of Defense shall, in coordination with the Secretaries of the military departments, submit to Congress a report on the manner in which the Department of Defense intends—

(1) to improve the oversight and accountability of the Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps (ROTC) programs; and

(2) to ensure that the Secretary of Defense, the Armed Forces, and Congress have a comprehensive understanding whether particular programs are achieving desired results before decisions to close or terminate such programs are undertaken.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The report required by subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) An assessment of—

(A) existing Department of Defense processes to evaluate the performance of the Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps programs;

(B) the clarity of goals and objectives for the Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps programs;

(C) the frequency of evaluation of the Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps programs;

(D) the adequacy of the oversight roles and responsibilities outlined in Department of Defense Instruction Number 1215.08, dated June 26, 2006; and

(E) the efforts undertaken by the Armed Forces to effectively communicate evaluations of the performance of the Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps programs to

Congress and other key stakeholders before decisions to close or terminate particular programs are undertaken.

(2) A description of—

(A) the strategic goals and objectives of the Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps programs;

(B) officer output requirements under the Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps programs, set forth by institution of higher education concerned;

(C) attrition rates under the Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps programs, set forth by institution of higher education concerned;

(D) the characteristics of quality officers graduating from Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps programs; and

(E) the current timeline for any anticipated closure or termination of a Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps program.

(3) A detailed plan for—

(A) improving the oversight and accountability of the Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps programs; and

(B) ensuring the Secretary of Defense, the Armed Forces, and Congress have a comprehensive understanding whether particular Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps programs are achieving desired results before decisions to close or terminate such programs are undertaken.

SA 4589. Mr. HEINRICH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

After section 216, insert the following:

SEC. 216A. HIGH ENERGY LASER SYSTEMS TEST FACILITY.

(a) INDEPENDENT EVALUATION.—The Secretary of Defense shall enter into an agreement with an independent entity to conduct an evaluation and assessment of options to provide financial resources for the High Energy Laser Systems Test Facility (HELSTF) in accordance with the recommendations in the 2009 report of the Test Resource Management Center and High Energy Laser Joint Program Office entitled ''Impact Report to Congress on High Energy Laser Systems Test Facility (HELSTF) and Plan for Test and Evaluation of High Energy Laser Systems'', and other relevant reports, including—

(1) the transfer of management of the Facility to the Joint Directed Energy Program Office (JDEPO), as redesignated by section 216(b); and

(2) modifications of funding for the Joint Directed Energy Program Office in order to provide adequate financial resources for the Facility.

(b) REPORT.—Under the agreement entered into pursuant to subsection (a), the entity conducting the evaluation and assessment required pursuant to that subsection shall, by not later than January 31, 2017, submit to the Secretary, and to the congressional defense committees, a report setting forth the results of the evaluation and assessment, including such recommendations for legislative and administrative action with respect to the financial resources and organization of the High Energy Laser Systems Test Facility as the entity considers appropriate.

SA 4590. Mrs. MCCASKILL (for herself and Mr. BLUNT) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2943, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle I of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1097. RECONSIDERATION OF CLAIMS FOR DISABILITY COMPENSATION FOR VETERANS WHO WERE THE SUBJECTS OF MUSTARD GAS OR LEWISITE EXPERIMENTS DURING WORLD WAR II.

(a) RECONSIDERATION OF CLAIMS FOR DISABILITY COMPENSATION IN CONNECTION WITH EXPOSURE TO MUSTARD GAS OR LEWISITE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, shall reconsider all claims for compensation described in paragraph (2) and make a new determination regarding each such claim.

(2) CLAIMS FOR COMPENSATION DESCRIBED.—Claims for compensation described in this paragraph are claims for compensation under chapter 11 of title 38, United States Code, that the Secretary of Veterans Affairs determines are in connection with exposure to mustard gas or lewisite during active military, naval, or air service during World War II and that were denied before the date of the enactment of this Act.

(3) PRESUMPTION OF EXPOSURE.—In carrying out paragraph (1), if the Secretary of Veterans Affairs or the Secretary of Defense makes a determination regarding whether a veteran who has filed a claim for compensation described in paragraph (2) has experienced full-body exposure to mustard gas or lewisite, such Secretary—

(A) shall presume that the veteran experienced full-body exposure to mustard gas or lewisite, as the case may be, unless proven otherwise; and

(B) may not use information contained in the DoD and VA Chemical Biological Warfare Database or any list of known testing sites for mustard gas or lewisite maintained by the Department of Veterans Affairs or the Department of Defense as the sole reason for determining that the veteran did not experience full-body exposure to mustard gas or lewisite.

(4) REPORT.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and not less frequently than once every 90 days thereafter, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report specifying any claims reconsidered under paragraph (1) that were denied during the 90-day period preceding the submittal of the report, including the rationale for each such denial.

(b) DEVELOPMENT OF POLICY.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs and the Secretary of Defense shall jointly establish a policy for processing future claims for compensation under chapter 11 of title 38, United States Code, that the Secretary of Veterans Affairs determines are in connection with exposure to mustard gas or lewisite during active military, naval, or air service during World War II.

(c) INVESTIGATION AND REPORT BY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall—

(1) for purposes of determining whether a site should be added to the list of the Department of Defense of sites where mustard gas or lewisite testing occurred, investigate and assess sites where—

(A) the Army Corps of Engineers has uncovered evidence of mustard gas or lewisite testing; or

(B) more than two veterans have submitted claims for compensation under chapter 11 of title 38, United States Code, in connection with exposure to mustard gas or lewisite at such site and such claims were denied; and

(2) submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report on experiments conducted by the Department of Defense during World War II to assess the effects of mustard gas and lewisite on people, which shall include—

(A) a list of each location where such an experiment occurred, including locations investigated and assessed under paragraph (1);

(B) the dates of each such experiment; and

(C) the number of members of the Armed Forces who were exposed to mustard gas or lewisite in each such experiment.

(d) INVESTIGATION AND REPORT BY SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall—

(1) investigate and assess—

(A) the actions taken by the Secretary to reach out to individuals who had been exposed to mustard gas or lewisite in the experiments described in subsection (c)(2)(A); and

(B) the claims for disability compensation under laws administered by the Secretary that were filed with the Secretary and the percentage of such claims that were denied by the Secretary; and

(2) submit to the appropriate committees of Congress—

(A) a report on the findings of the Secretary with respect to the investigations and assessments carried out under paragraph (1); and

(B) a comprehensive list of each location where an experiment described in subsection (c)(2)(A) was conducted.

(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The terms ''active military, naval, or air service'', ''veteran'', and ''World War II'' have the meanings given such terms in section 101 of title 38, United States Code.

(2) The term ''appropriate committees of Congress'' means—

(A) the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the Committee on Armed Services, and the Special Committee on Aging of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives.

(3) The term ''full-body exposure'', with respect to mustard gas or lewisite, has the meaning given that term by the Secretary of Defense.

SA 4591. Mr. REED submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title XXVIII, add the following:

SEC. 2826. LIMITATION ON CONVEYANCE OF REAL PROPERTY AT NAVAL STATION NEWPORT, RHODE ISLAND.

None of the funds authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available by this or any other Act may be obligated or expended to carry out the conveyance or other

disposal of real property by the Department of the Navy at Naval Station Newport, Rhode Island, unless such property is first offered for conveyance to relevant State and local jurisdictions.

SA 4592. Ms. HIRONO (for herself and Mr. ROUNDS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2943, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle I of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1097. WATER RESOURCE AGREEMENTS WITH FOREIGN ALLIES AND ORGANIZATIONS IN SUPPORT OF CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS.

The Secretary of Defense, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, is authorized to enter into agreements with the governments of allied countries and organizations described in section 2350a(2) of title 10, United States Code, to develop land-based water resources in support of and in preparation for contingency operations, including water efficiency, reuse, selection, pumping, purification, storage, research and development, distribution, cooling, consumption, water source intelligence, training, acquisition of water support equipment, and water support operations.

SA 4593. Mr. LEE (for himself and Ms. KLOBUCHAR) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title III, add the following:

SEC. 341. FULL FAITH AND CREDIT GRANTED TO OCCUPATIONAL LICENSES AND CERTIFICATIONS ISSUED BY STATES FOR PURPOSES OF ACTIVITIES ON MILITARY INSTALLATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Federal Government shall provide full faith and credit to an occupational license or certification granted by a State for the purpose of establishing an individual's authorization to engage in the occupation on a military installation located on land owned by the Federal Government, provided that the license or certification is not expired, revoked, or suspended by the issuing State, and provided that there are no outstanding enforcement actions against the individual brought by the licensing board or certifying authority for that occupation in the issuing State.

(b) SCOPE OF PRACTICE.—An individual relying on subsection (a) for authorization to engage in an occupation is authorized to sell those goods and services covered by the occupational license or certification.

(c) STATE DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''State'' includes the District of Columbia.

SA 4594. Mr. GRAHAM (for himself and Mr. MCCAIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1216. SENSE OF SENATE ON THE CRITICAL IMPORTANCE OF THE ADVICE OF MILITARY COMMANDERS TO ENSURE FORCE LEVELS IN AFGHANISTAN AFTER 2016 ARE CONDITIONS-BASED.

(a) FINDING.—The Senate makes the following findings:

(1) The United States vowed to hold those responsible for the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks accountable, and seeks to ensure that terrorists never again use Afghan soil to plot an attack on another country.

(2) Following the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, the United States decisively expelled the Taliban from control of Afghanistan and sought to promote a multilateral agenda to stabilize and reconstruct Afghanistan and rebuild its institutions and economy.

(3) The United States and Afghanistan signed a Bilateral Security Agreement (BSA) on September 30, 2014, that provides for an enduring commitment between the Government of the United States and the Government of Afghanistan to enhance the ability of the Government of Afghanistan to deter internal and external threats against its sovereignty.

(4) The Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL) has metastasized beyond the borders of Iraq and Syria, announcing its formation on January 10, 2015, in Afghanistan where it carries out bombings, small arms attacks, and kidnappings against civilians and security forces in a number of provinces.

(5) On September 28, 2015, Taliban fighters took over the city of Kunduz, Afghanistan, after government forces fully retreated, giving the insurgents a military and political victory that had evaded them since 2001.

(6) Since the beginning of 2016, current Commander of Resolute Support and United States Forces-Afghanistan, General John W. Nicholson Jr., former Commander of Resolute Support and United States Forces-Afghanistan, General John F. Campbell, and current Commander of United States Central Command, General Joseph L. Votel—the senior military commanders closest to the fight—have testified that the security situation in Afghanistan is deteriorating and support a withdrawal of United States forces from Afghanistan only when conditions warrant.

(7) On April 19, 2016, the Taliban carried out a suicide bomb and gun assault on a government security building in Kabul, Afghanistan, killing at least 28 people and wounding more than 320, marking the single deadliest attack in the capital of Afghanistan since 2011.

(8) In the first three months of 2016, the United Nations reported that Afghanistan documented 600 civilian deaths and 1,343 wounded, with almost one-third of the casualties being children.

(b) SENSE OF SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the future trajectory of security and stability in Afghanistan is contingent upon the proper force levels of the United States and coalition partners, which must be conditions-based;

(2) adjustments to force levels in Afghanistan should be made with all due consideration to the assessment and advice of military commanders on the ground;

(3) decisions on force levels in Afghanistan should take into account the capabilities required to preserve and promote the hard-fought gains achieved over the last 15 years;

(4) United States force levels in Afghanistan should be determined in a timely manner and made known to allies and partners to afford adequate planning and force generation lead times;

(5) the United States must continue its efforts to train and advise the Afghan National Security Forces (ANSF) in warfighting functions so that they are capable of defending their country and ensuring that Afghanistan never again succumbs to the fate of being a terrorist safe-haven for groups like the Taliban, al Qaeda, and the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL);

(6) the United States must continue, in conjunction with the Afghan National Security Forces, to operate a robust counterterrorism force to deal with evolving and immediate threats to the national security interests of the United States;

(7) the decision of the President in October 2015 to maintain the current United States force level of 9,800 members of the Armed Forces in Afghanistan was in the national security interests of the United States; and

(8) Congress would support the President if the President decided to maintain the current level of United States forces in Afghanistan and adjust such level based on conditions on the ground.

SA 4595. Mr. MCCAIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4229 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill S. 2943, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 12, line 5, strike ''$7,200,000'' and insert ''$8,700,000''.

SA 4596. Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. SANDERS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1004. ENCOURAGEMENT OF IMPROVEMENT OF ABILITY OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE TO OBTAIN AND MAINTAIN CLEAN AUDIT OPINIONS.

(a) FINANCIAL AUDIT INCENTIVE FUND.—The Secretary of Defense shall establish a fund to be known as the ''Financial Audit Incentive Fund'' (in this section referred to as the ''Fund'') for the purpose of encouraging the organizations, components, and elements of the military departments to maintain unmodified audit opinions.

(b) AVAILABILITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Amounts in the Fund shall be available to the military departments to address readiness funding shortfalls for operational training exercises, including home station training, brigade-level or equivalent training, or joint exercises directed by combatant commanders.

(2) TRANSFERS FROM FUND.—Amounts in the Fund may be transferred to any other account of a military department in order to fund training described in paragraph (1). Any amounts transferred from the Fund to an account shall be merged with amounts in the account to which transferred and shall be available subject to the same terms and conditions as amounts in such account, except that amounts so transferred shall remain available until expended. The authority to transfer amounts under this paragraph is in addition to any other authority of the Secretary to transfer amounts by law.

(3) LIMITATION.—Amounts in the Fund may be transferred under this subsection only to organizations components, and elements of the military departments that have a current unmodified audit opinion for use by such organizations components, and elements for purposes specified in paragraph (1).

(c) TRANSFERS TO FUND IN CONNECTION WITH ORGANIZATIONS NOT HAVING ACHIEVED QUALIFIED AUDIT OPINIONS.—

(1) REDUCTION IN AMOUNT AVAILABLE.—Subject to paragraph (2), if during any fiscal year after fiscal year 2019 the Secretary determines that an organization, component, or element of the Department has not achieved a qualified opinion of its statement of budgetary resources for the calender year ending during such fiscal year—

(A) the amount available to such organization, component, or element for the fiscal year in which such determination is made shall be equal to—

(i) the amount otherwise authorized to be appropriated for such organization, component, or element for the fiscal year; minus

(ii) the lesser of—

(I) an amount equal to 0.5 percent of the amount described in clause (i); or

(II) $100,000,000; and

(B) the Secretary shall deposit in the Fund all amounts unavailable to organizations, components, and elements of the Department in the fiscal year pursuant to determinations made under subparagraph (A).

(2) INAPPLICABILITY TO AMOUNTS FOR MILITARY PERSONNEL.—Any reduction applicable to an organization, component, or element of the Department under paragraph (1) for a fiscal year shall not apply to amounts, if any, available to such organization, component, or element for the fiscal year for military personnel.

SA 4597. Mrs. BOXER (for herself, Mrs. SHAHEEN, and Mr. MENENDEZ) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2943, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle H of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1277. OFFICE OF GLOBAL WOMEN'S ISSUES.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary of State shall establish in the Office of the Secretary of the Department of State an Office of Global Women's Issues (in this section referred to as the ''Office''). The Office shall be headed by an Ambassador-at-Large for Global Women's Issues, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Ambassador-at-Large shall report directly to the Secretary and shall have the rank and status of Ambassador-at-Large.

(b) PURPOSE.—In addition to the duties described in subsection (c) and those duties determined by the Secretary of State, the Ambassador-at-Large shall coordinate efforts of the United States Government, as directed by the Secretary regarding gender integration and advancing the status of women and girls in United States foreign policy.

(c) DUTIES.—The Ambassador-at-Large—

(1) shall serve as the principal advisor to the Secretary of State regarding gender equality, women's empowerment, and violence against women and girls as a foreign policy matter;

(2) is authorized to represent the United States in diplomatic and multilateral fora on matters relevant to the status of women and girls;

(3) shall advise and provide input to the Secretary on all activities, policies, programs, and funding relating to gender equality and the advancement of women and girls internationally for all bureaus and offices of the Department of State and in the international programs of all other Federal agencies;

(4) shall work to ensure that efforts to advance gender equality and women's empowerment are fully integrated into the programs, structures, processes, and capacities of all bureaus and offices of the Department of State and in the international programs of other Federal agencies;

(5) shall direct, as appropriate, United States Government resources to respond to needs for gender integration and empowerment of women in United States Government foreign policies and international programs;

(6) may design, support, and implement activities regarding empowerment of women internationally; and

(7) shall conduct regular consultation with civil society organizations working to advance gender equality and empower women and girls internationally.

SA 4598. Mr. SCHUMER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title I, add the following:

SEC. 128. TESTING AND INTEGRATION OF MINEHUNTING SONARS FOR LITTORAL COMBAT SHIP MINE HUNTING CAPABILITIES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The Department of the Navy has determined that the Remote Minehunting System (RMS) has not performed satisfactorily.

(2) On February 26, 2016, Secretary of the Navy Ray Mabus stated that new testing must be done to find a reliable solution to the mine countermeasures mission package and that the Navy wants to ''get it out there as quickly as you can and test it in a more realistic environment''.

(3) There are several mature unmanned surface vehicle-towed and unmanned underwater vehicle-based synthetic aperture sonar (SAS) sensors in use by the Department of Defense and navies of allied nations.

(4) SAS sensors could provide a technology that would meet the Littoral Combat Ship (LCS) minehunting area clearance rate sustained requirement.

(b) ASSESSMENT REQUIRED.—The Secretary of the Navy shall perform at-sea testing of a range of sonar technologies to determine which systems can meet the requirements of the Navy LCS mine countermeasure mission package (MCM MP).

(c) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than September 30, 2019, the Secretary of the Navy shall—

(A) conduct operational at-sea testing and experimentation of currently available and deployable United States and allied conventional side-scan sonars and synthetic aperture sonars;

(B) complete an assessment of minehunting sonar technologies that could meet the requirements for the LCS MCM MP; and

(C) submit to the congressional defense committees a report that contains the results of the at-sea testing and assessment described in subparagraphs (A) and (B).

(2) ELEMENTS.—The assessment required under paragraph (1)(B) shall include—

(A) specific details regarding the capabilities of current United States Navy minehunting sonars and in-production SAS sensors available for integration in the LCS MCM MP;

(B) an estimate of the capabilities that could be achieved by integrating SAS sensors in the LCS MCM MP; and

(C) recommendations to enhance the minehunting capabilities of the LCS MCM MP using conventional sonar systems and SAS systems.

(d) SONAR SYSTEM DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''sonar system'' includes, at a minimum, sonar systems relying on conventional sonars, side-scan sonars, or synthetic aperture sonars.

SA 4599. Mr. PORTMAN (for himself and Mr. MURPHY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title XII, add the following:

Subtitle I—Countering Foreign Propaganda and Disinformation Act

SEC. 1281. CENTER FOR INFORMATION ANALYSIS AND RESPONSE.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall establish a Center for Information Analysis and Response (in this section referred to as the ''Center''). The purposes of the Center are—

(1) to coordinate the sharing among government agencies of information on foreign government information warfare efforts, including information provided by recipients of information access fund grants awarded using funds made available under subsection (e) and from other sources, subject to the appropriate classification guidelines;

(2) to establish a process for integrating information on foreign propaganda and disinformation efforts into national strategy; and

(3) to develop, plan, and synchronize interagency activities to expose and counter foreign information operations directed against United States national security interests and advance narratives that support United States allies and interests.

(b) FUNCTIONS.—The Center shall carry out the following functions:

(1) Integrating interagency efforts to track and evaluate counterfactual narratives abroad that threaten the national security interests of the United States and United

States allies, subject to appropriate regulations governing the dissemination of classified information and programs.

(2) Analyzing relevant information from United States Government agencies, allied nations, think-tanks, academic institutions, civil society groups, and other nongovernmental organizations.

(3) Developing and disseminating thematic narratives and analysis to counter propaganda and disinformation directed at United States allies and partners in order to safeguard United States allies and interests.

(4) Identifying current and emerging trends in foreign propaganda and disinformation, including the use of print, broadcast, online and social media, support for third-party outlets such as think tanks, political parties, and nongovernmental organizations, in order to coordinate and shape the development of tactics, techniques, and procedures to expose and refute foreign misinformation and disinformation and proactively promote fact-based narratives and policies to audiences outside the United States.

(5) Facilitating the use of a wide range of information-related technologies and techniques to counter foreign disinformation by sharing expertise among agencies, seeking expertise from external sources, and implementing best practices.

(6) Identifying gaps in United States capabilities in areas relevant to the Center's mission and recommending necessary enhancements or changes.

(7) Identifying the countries and populations most susceptible to foreign government propaganda and disinformation.

(8) Administering and expending funds made available pursuant to subsection (e).

(9) Coordinating with allied and partner nations, particularly those frequently targeted by foreign disinformation operations, and international organizations and entities such as the NATO Center of Excellence on Strategic Communications, the European Endowment for Democracy, and the European External Action Service Task Force on Strategic Communications, in order to amplify the Center's efforts and avoid duplication.

(c) INTERAGENCY MANAGER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The President is authorized to designate an official of the United States Government to lead an interagency team and to manage the Center. The President shall delegate to the manager of the Center responsibility for and presumptive authority to direct and coordinate the activities and operations of all departments, agencies, and elements of the United States Government in so far as their support is required to ensure the successful implementation of a strategy approved by the President for accomplishing the mission. The official so designated shall be serving in a position in the executive branch by appointment, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

(2) INTERAGENCY STEERING COMMITTEE.—

(A) COMPOSITION.—The Interagency Manager shall establish a Steering Committee composed of senior representatives of agencies relevant to the Center's mission to provide advice to the Manager on the operations and strategic orientation of the Center and to ensure adequate support for the Center. The Steering Committee shall include one senior representative designated by each of the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development, and the Chairman of the Broadcasting Board of Governors.

(B) MEETINGS.—The Interagency Steering Committee shall meet not less than every 3 months.

(C) PARTICIPATION AND INDEPENDENCE.—The Chairman of the Broadcasting Board of Governors shall not compromise the journalistic freedom or integrity of relevant media organizations. Other Federal agencies may be invited to participate in the Steering Committee at the discretion of the Chairman of the Steering Committee and with the consent of the Secretary of State.

(3) SCOPE OF RESPONSIBILITY AND AUTHORITY.—

(A) LIMITATION ON SCOPE.—The delegated responsibility and authority provided pursuant to paragraph (1) may not extend beyond the requirements for successful implementation of the mission and strategy described in that paragraph.

(B) APPEAL OF EXECUTION OF ACTIVITIES.—The head of any department, agency, or other element of the United States Government may appeal to the President a requirement or direction by the official designated pursuant to paragraph (1) for activities otherwise in support of the mission and strategy described in that paragraph if such head determines that there is a compelling case that executing such activities would do undue harm to other missions of national importance to the United States.

(4) TARGETED FOREIGN AUDIENCES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The activities under this subsection of the Center described in paragraph (1) shall be done only with the intent to influence foreign audiences. No funds for the activities of the team under this section may be used with the intent to influence public opinion in the United States.

(B) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection may be construed to prohibit the team described in paragraph (1) from engaging in any form of communication or medium, either directly or indirectly, or coordinating with any other department or agency of the United States Government, a State government, or any other public or private organization or institution because a United States domestic audience is or may be thereby exposed to activities or communications of the team under this subsection, or based on a presumption of such exposure.

(d) STAFF.—

(1) COMPENSATION.—The President may fix the compensation of the manager of the Center and other personnel without regard to chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of title 5, United States Code, relating to classification of positions and General Schedule pay rates, except that the rate of pay for the executive director and other personnel may not exceed the rate payable for level V of the Executive Schedule under section 5316 of that title.

(2) DETAIL OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES.—Any Federal Government employee may be detailed to the Center without reimbursement, and such detail shall be without interruption or loss of civil service status or privilege.

(3) PROCUREMENT OF TEMPORARY AND INTERMITTENT SERVICES.—The President may procure temporary and intermittent services under section 3109(b) of title 5, United States Code, at rates for individuals which do not exceed the daily equivalent of the annual rate of basic pay prescribed for level V of the Executive Schedule under section 5316 of that title.

(e) FUNDS.—Of amounts authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2017 for the Department of Defense by this Act and identified as undistributed fuel cost savings as specified in the funding tables in division D, up to $250,000,000 may be available for purposes of carrying out this section and the grant program established under section 1282. Once obligated, such funds shall remain available for such purposes until expended.

SEC. 1282. INFORMATION ACCESS FUNDS.

(a) GRANTS AND CONTRACTS OF FINANCIAL SUPPORT.—The Center may provide grants or contracts of financial support to civil society groups, journalists, nongovernmental organizations, federally funded research and development centers, private companies, or academic institutions for the following purposes:

(1) To support local independent media who are best placed to refute foreign disinformation and manipulation in their own communities.

(2) To collect and store examples in print, online, and social media of disinformation, misinformation, and propaganda directed at the United States and its allies and partners.

(3) To analyze tactics, techniques, and procedures of foreign government information warfare with respect to disinformation, misinformation, and propaganda.

(4) To support efforts by the Center to counter efforts by foreign governments to use disinformation, misinformation, and propaganda to influence the policies and social and political stability of the United States and United States allies and partners.

(b) FUNDING AVAILABILITY AND LIMITATIONS.—All organizations that apply to receive funds under this section must undergo a vetting process in accordance with the relevant existing regulations to ensure their bona fides, capability, and experience, and their compatibility with United States interests and objectives.

SEC. 1283. INCLUSION IN DEPARTMENT OF STATE EDUCATION AND CULTURAL EXCHANGE PROGRAMS OF FOREIGN STUDENTS AND COMMUNITY LEADERS FROM COUNTRIES AND POPULATIONS SUSCEPTIBLE TO FOREIGN MANIPULATION.

The President shall ensure that when the Secretary of State is selecting participants for United States educational and cultural exchange programs, the Secretary of State gives special consideration to students and community leaders from populations and countries the Secretary deems vulnerable to foreign propaganda and disinformation campaigns.

SEC. 1284. REPORTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the establishment of the Center, the President submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report evaluating the success of the Center in fulfilling the purposes for which it was authorized and outlining steps to improve any areas of deficiency.

(b) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means—

(1) the congressional defense committees, the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate; and

(2) the congressional defense committees, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Homeland Security, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 1285. TERMINATION OF CENTER AND STEERING COMMITTEE.

The Center for Information Analysis and Response and the interagency team established under section 1281(c) shall terminate 15 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 1286. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION REGARDING RELATIONSHIP TO INTELLIGENCE AUTHORITIES AND ACTIVITIES.

Nothing in this subtitle shall be construed as superseding or modifying any existing authorities governing the collection, sharing, and implementation of intelligence programs

and activities or existing regulations governing the sharing of classified information and programs.

SA 4600. Mr. CORNYN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle H of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1277. REPORT ON POTENTIAL VIOLATIONS BY IRAN OF THE RIGHT UNDER INTERNATIONAL LAW TO CONDUCT INNOCENT PASSAGE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that includes a determination with respect to whether, during or after the incident that began on January 12, 2016, in which forces of Iran boarded two United States Navy riverine combat vessels and detained at gunpoint the crews of those vessels, any of the actions of the forces of Iran constituted a violation of the right under international law to conduct innocent passage.

(b) ACTIONS TO BE ASSESSED.—In assessing actions of the forces of Iran under subsection (a), the Secretary shall consider, at a minimum, the following actions:

(1) The stopping, boarding, search, and seizure of the two United States Navy riverine combat vessels in the incident described in subsection (a).

(2) The removal from their vessels and detention of members of the United States Armed Forces in that incident.

(3) The theft or confiscation of electronic navigational equipment or any other equipment from the vessels.

(4) The forcing of one or more members of the United States Armed Forces to apologize for their actions.

(5) The display, videotaping, or photographing of members of the United States Armed Forces and the subsequent broadcasting or other use of those photographs or videos.

(6) The forcing of female members of the United States Armed Forces to wear head coverings.

(c) DESCRIPTION OF ACTIONS.—In the case of each action that the Secretary determines under subsection (a) is a violation of the right under international law to conduct innocent passage, the Secretary shall include in the report required by that subsection a description of the action and an explanation of how the action violated that right.

(d) FORM OF REPORT.—The report required by subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means—

(A) the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives.

(2) FORCES OF IRAN.—The term ''forces of Iran'' means the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps, members of other military or paramilitary units of the Government of Iran, and other agents of that Government.

(3) INNOCENT PASSAGE.—The term ''innocent passage'' means the principle under customary international law that all vessels have the right to conduct innocent passage through another country's territorial waters for the purpose of continuous and expeditious traversing.

SA 4601. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title III, add the following:

SEC. 341. MITIGATION OF RISKS POSED BY ZIKA VIRUS.

(a) INSECT REPELLANT AND OTHER MEASURES TO PROTECT SERVICE MEMBERS FROM THE ZIKA VIRUS.—Funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for the Department of Defense shall be made available for the deployment of insect repellant and other appropriate measures for members of the Armed Forces and Department of Defense civilian personnel stationed in or deployed to areas affected by the Zika virus, as well as the treatment for insects at military installations located in areas affected by the Zika virus inside and outside the United States. Using existing authorities to work with foreign governments that host United States military and civilian personnel, the Department shall provide support as appropriate to those foreign governments to counter insects at foreign military installations where members of the Armed Forces and Department of Defense civilian personnel are stationed in areas affected by the Zika virus.

(b) REPORT ON EFFORTS TO MITIGATE RISK TO SERVICE MEMBERS POSED BY THE ZIKA VIRUS.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the risk members of the Armed Forces face of contracting the Zika virus and the mitigation efforts being taken by the Department of Defense in response. The report shall include a strategy to counter the virus should it become a long-term issue.

(c) AREAS AFFECTED BY THE ZIKA VIRUS DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''areas affected by the Zika virus'' means areas under a level 2 or level 3 travel advisory notice issued by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention related to the Zika virus.

SA 4602. Mr. UDALL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle I of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1097. INTERNATIONAL INFRASTRUCTURE SIMULATION AND ANALYSIS CENTER.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—Using existing funds, the Secretary of Defense is authorized to work in consultation with the Secretary of Energy to develop an International Infrastructure Simulation and Analysis Center.

(b) PURPOSE.—The International Infrastructure Simulation and Analysis Center may serve as the key asset for gathering, analyzing, and disseminating information to the Department of Defense, the Department of Energy, and the National Security Council for the purposes of—

(1) providing advanced modeling, simulation, and analysis capabilities to analyze critical infrastructure interdependencies, vulnerabilities, and complexities outside the United States;

(2) providing analysis and data to policy makers and decision makers to aid in the prevention or response to humanitarian or other threats outside the United States; and

(3) providing strategic, multidisciplinary analyses of infrastructure interdependencies and the consequences of infrastructure disruptions across multiple infrastructure sectors outside the United States.

(c) USE OF EXISTING FACILITIES.—The International Infrastructure Simulation and Analysis Center should utilize existing Department of Defense or Department of Energy facilities.

(d) CAPABILITIES.—The Center should include the following capabilities:

(1) Process-based systems dynamic models.

(2) Mathematical network optimization models.

(3) Physics-based models of existing infrastructure.

(4) High fidelity, agent-based simulations of systems.

(5) Other systems capabilities as deemed necessary by the Secretary of Defense to fulfil the mission needs of the Department of Defense.

SA 4603. Mr. REID submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

This Act shall be in effect 1 day after enactment.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 8, 2016, at 2:30 p.m., in room SR–253 of the Russell Senate Office Building to conduct a hearing entitled ''Implementation of the Fast Act.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 8, 2016, at 9:30 a.m., in room SD–215 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to

meet during the session of the Senate on June 8, 2016, at 3:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing entitled ''Nominations.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Indian Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 8, 2016, in room SD–628 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, at 2:15 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 8, 2016.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON AFRICA AND GLOBAL HEALTH POLICY

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations Subcommittee on Africa and Global Health Policy be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 8, 2016, at 2:15 p.m., to conduct a hearing entitled ''U.S. Sanctions Policy in Sub-Saharan Africa.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND THE NATIONAL INTEREST

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Immigration and the National Interest be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 8, 2016, at 2:30 p.m., in room SD–226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''The H–2B Temporary Foreign Worker Program: Examining the Effects of Americas' Job Opportunities and Wages.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, first, I ask unanimous consent that Laura Malenas and Kevin Craw, who are both fellows in my office, be granted floor privileges for the remainder of the Senate's consideration of the NDAA.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following interns from my office be granted the privilege of the floor for the month of June: Coreanne Bean, Emily Harland, Clara Baldwin, Kea Bekkendahl, Desiree Cleary, Xochitl Martinez, Teresa Wrobel, Karl Lundgren, Robin O'Donoghue, Bernie Franulovich, Andrea Witte, and Noam Levenson; and I also ask unanimous consent that Tyler Schroeber be granted the privilege of the floor for the balance of the day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Giselle Naranjo-Cruz be granted privileges of the floor today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, JUNE 9, 2016

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m. tomorrow, Thursday, June 9; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; further, that following leader remarks, the Senate resume consideration of S. 2943; finally, that notwithstanding the provisions of rule XXII, the cloture motions with respect to Reed amendment No. 4549 and McCain amendment No. 4229 ripen at 11:15 a.m. tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned, following the remarks of Senator MCCAIN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Arizona.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION BILL

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I would like to make a couple of comments about the progress of the legislation.

As it just happened, the majority leader has filed cloture on the bill, which means that if 30 hours are consumed, then we would be here on Friday. I certainly hope that is not the case. We are negotiating several contentious issues which, if those negotiations are successful, I would anticipate a number of votes tomorrow morning. If we are unable to, then it is going to stretch out into the afternoon or even to the next day for final passage.

I thank every Member who has been engaged in this process. Literally every Member has had an amendment or some involvement in this issue, and I think that is the healthiest thing about consideration of this bill, which, obviously I say with some bias, is the most important legislation that we take up, given that its responsibilities are to the men and women who are serving in our military in harm's way in a very dangerous world.

I thank my colleagues for their cooperation, and hopefully we can reach some agreements tonight and tomorrow to expedite the process and get final passage.

I note the presence of the Senator from Rhode Island, and I wonder if he has any comments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I second Senator MCCAIN's comments about the cooperation and collaboration. We hope that tomorrow we can move forward on several amendments, and I want to join him in commending and thanking our colleagues for their help.

Thank you.

Mr. President, I believe we have both yielded the floor.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until 9:30 a.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 9:09 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, June 9, 2016, at 9:30 a.m.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

IN RECOGNITION OF HEARTLINE PRESS

HON. PATRICK MEEHAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 8, 2016

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Heartline Press on winning SCORE's 2016 Small Business Achievement Award.

SCORE is a national nonprofit that provides free business mentoring and educational workshops to entrepreneurs and small business owners across the country. I am grateful for the services local SCORE chapters provide for our region's innovative entrepreneurs. And I commend the Chester County Chapter on being named ''2015 Chapter of the Year,'' edging out over 300 other chapters around the country.

Ryan Hartley, founder of Heartline Press, developed his passion for the offset lithography printing process while attending Springfield High School. Bob Preston, who operated the school's print shop, became a lifelong mentor and encouraged Hartley to start his own printing company in 2005.

Hartley was working long hours and the business was barely profitable. So in 2012 he reached out to SCORE and was introduced to SCORE counselors who helped him reorganize his business to operate it more efficiently and effectively. Hartley also enhanced his web design services and developed a strong social media marketing campaign.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Mr. Hartley on his success through the SCORE mentorship program.

HONORING JACOB BRUNS

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 8, 2016

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Jacob Bruns. Jake is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 1099, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Jake has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Jake has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Jake has contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Jacob Bruns for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

ZACHARY FITZMIER

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 8, 2016

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Zachary Fitzmier for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Zachary Fitzmier is an 11th grader at Pomona High School and received this award because his determination and hard work have allowed him to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Zachary Fitzmier is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Zachary Fitzmier for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt he will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of his future accomplishments.

TRIBUTE TO DR. CHARLES ELACHI

HON. ADAM B. SCHIFF

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 8, 2016

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor my dear friend Dr. Charles Elachi, as he concludes 46 years of service to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration's (NASA) Jet Propulsion Laboratory (JPL). As Director of JPL for the last 15 years, Dr. Elachi has been an exceptional leader and invaluable contributor to space exploration.

Born and raised in Lebanon, Dr. Elachi left home to pursue a Bachelor of Science degree in physics from the University of Grenoble, France. From there he received his Diplome Ingenieur in engineering from the Polytechnic Institute, Grenoble. He continued his education at the California Institute of Technology where he received his Master of Science and Doctoral degrees in electrical sciences. After joining JPL in 1970, Dr. Elachi continued his education at the University of Southern California where he received his Master of Business Administration, and the University of California, Los Angeles where he received his Master of Science in Geology.

Dr. Elachi began his 46 year career at JPL as a research and science investigator. Quickly rising to leadership, he served as Principal Investigator on numerous NASA projects, most notably the Shuttle Imaging Radar series, the Magellan Imaging Radar, and the Cassini Titan Radar. From 1982 to 2000, Dr. Elachi served as Director for Space and Earth Science Programs at JPL and was responsible for the overall development of instruments for Earth observation, planetary exploration, and astrophysics and the missions utilizing those instruments.

In May of 2001, Dr. Elachi was appointed Director of JPL and through the years has steadfastly stewarded JPL to unparalleled success. JPL's highly successful Mars missions—Phoenix and the rovers Spirit, Opportunity and Curiosity—have pushed the boundaries of robotic exploration and have inspired a new generation of scientists. Earth missions such as GRACE, Jason 1, 2, and 3, Aquarius, and Cloudsat to name a few, have furthered our understanding of Earth's climate and given us critical data on the planet we call home. Far beyond our planet, Juno, Kepler, Dawn, and many other missions are studying various parts of our solar system and beyond. Under Dr. Elachi's tenure, these successful missions and JPL's consistent ability to deliver on target have created innumerable job opportunities locally and nationally, and have continued JPL's distinction and prominence in space exploration.

Throughout his impressive career, Dr. Elachi has authored over 230 publications and lectured in more than 20 countries about space, planetary exploration, and Earth observation. He holds numerous patents in the fields of active microwave remote sensing and electromagnetic theory. Over the years, Dr. Elachi chaired a number of national and international committees which developed plans for the exploration of our solar system, neighboring solar systems, and Mars. His exceptional career includes over 30 awards and recognitions including the J.E. Hill Lifetime Space Achievement Award, the Association of Space Explorers Congress Crystal Helmet Award and the NASA Outstanding Leadership Medal in three different years, to name a few.

It is with great appreciation and respect that I congratulate Dr. Charles Elachi upon 46 years of exemplary public service. The time and energy Dr. Elachi put into his work is extraordinary and people across the globe have benefited greatly from his dedicated service. Applauding his commitment and dedication to NASA's JPL and its work, I now proudly ask you all to join me in commending Dr. Charles Elachi for his lifetime of service to our country.

HONORING THE SERVICE OF GARY EDMONDSON

HON. CHARLES W. BOUSTANY, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 8, 2016

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and service of Gary Edmondson. A veteran of the United States Army, Gary recently celebrated 70 years of playing TAPS at military funerals throughout the state of Louisiana at no cost to the families. He played his first military funeral in 1946, as a young Boy Scout at the age of 12 and for the last seven decades has never looked back.

Born in August of 1934 in Brooklyn, N.Y., Gary joined the Army at the age of 21; eventually earning a place in the U.S. Army band in Louisville, Ky. Gary dedicated his life to playing TAPS to honor fellow veterans at their funerals. After relocating to Lafayette, Louisiana, in 1959, he notified all six of the local funeral homes to let them know he was always available to play TAPS free of charge.

Since moving to Acadiana, Gary has become a fixture of the community. He has played countless funerals, military, veterans, and community events throughout his lifetime of service. Just this past Memorial Day, he played in services at Lafayette Memorial Park, as well as Green Lawn Memorial Park—a tradition he has kept since 1964.

Gary's seven decades of heartfelt dedication to our fallen heroes is an inspiration to us all. In 2013, he earned an induction into the Living Legends Hall of Fame in Erath, La. In 2014, he created the Acadiana Veterans Honor Guard and was instrumental in securing funding to ensure every local veteran will receive full military funeral honors. Beloved by the entire community; Gary Edmondson has enriched the lives of countless families during their darkest hours. I rise to ask my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join me in recognizing his lifetime of service, dedicated to providing the final tribute to our fallen heroes as their families lay them to rest.

IN SUPPORT OF THE AMERICAN POLITICAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATION CONGRESSIONAL FELLOWSHIP

HON. JIM McDERMOTT

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 8, 2016

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to draw attention to a development that remained largely unnoticed; discontinuation of the Fulbright Congressional Fellowship program run by the American Political Science Association (APSA).

My office has regularly welcomed international fellows. We continue to host these talented professionals from different areas around the world. Between 2004 and 2008, I hosted two APSA-Fulbright Congressional Fellows from India; an academic, Medha Nanivadekar, and a New Dehli journalist, Prasad Venkateswara Kunduri.

These Fellows brought a great deal of depth and perspective to the office at a time when relationship between United States of America and India was expanding like never before. Today, the U.S. and India are engaged across more than 60 fields.

Prasad, in particular came at a time when we in the Congress were deeply engaged and debating the Civil Nuclear Deal with India. I valued his perspective and understanding of the intricacies of discourse within India on the issue as well as the impact the process could have on U.S.-India relations and domestic politics.

During 2007–2008, Prasad spent a year in Washington, D.C. Since his return, he remains in contact with me and my office. He continues to share his experiences as a Fellow with his colleagues to promote a greater understanding of how the U.S. Congress works. When I have traveled to India he is engaged in events related to my trip. I continue to appreciate his perspective when working on issues related to India.

Since we do not have a regular official delegation-level exchange program between the U.S. Congress and Parliament of India many of us travel to India as part of various programs organized by different groups or CoDels which include special events like one that retraced Martin Luther King's journey in India. Events organized by former Fellows like Prasad help bridge the gap between U.S. lawmakers and people.

These Fellows who come to Washington, D.C. and spend a year on The Hill, help create a relationship with U.S. law-makers, staff, policy planners, advocacy groups and colleagues in the program. What they take back enriches the United States' relationship with these communities.

The Fulbright-APSA Congressional Fellowship Program was part of APSA's Congressional Fellowship Program. It was established over 60 years ago and remains a highly selective, non-partisan, early-to-mid career program devoted to expanding knowledge and awareness of Congress. The program enjoys a reputation for excellence among those concerned with the quality of government and the ways in which democracies function. The APSA-Congressional Fellowship ended after a five year run.

Appreciating the initiative and contribution of the program, I urge the Fulbright Board to reconsider and fund APSA Congressional Fellowship.

HONORING KAELIN HAGEN

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 8, 2016

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Kaelin Hagen. Kaelin is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 1099, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Kaelin has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Kaelin has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Kaelin has contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Kaelin Hagen for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

RECOGNIZING EARLINE ROGERS UPON HER RETIREMENT

HON. PETER J. VISCLOSKY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 8, 2016

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, today it is with profound respect that I take this time to honor one of Indiana's foremost citizens, State Senator Earline Rogers. A retired public school teacher, Earline has consistently distinguished herself as a pillar of her community, a voice for children, and a selfless public servant. Serving in the Indiana General Assembly for thirty-four years, Senator Rogers will be retiring this year after a truly monumental career.

Born in Gary, Indiana, Earline Rogers was inspired at an early age to be a force for positive change by her father, Earl Smith Sr., and her mother, Robbie. Employed as a steelworker, Earl worked tirelessly alongside his wife to support Earline and her four siblings, Gerry, Bobby, Earl Jr., and Denice. Taking on two part-time jobs in addition to his full-time position at the steel mill, Earl was determined to see his children graduate high school and attend college. Earline fulfilled her parents' dream and graduated as senior class president with honors from Roosevelt High School in Gary, and went on to earn Bachelor of Science and Master of Science degrees in Education from Indiana University. Following her undergraduate studies, Earline began her career teaching in the Gary Community School Corporation, and soon became active in the American Federation of Teachers union, working to provide teachers with the best resources to educate their students and provide them with pathways to success. Senator Rogers was elected to the Gary Common Council in 1980, and broke barriers serving as the Council's first female president. In 1982, Senator Rogers was elected to the Indiana House of Representatives, and in 1990, she became a member of the Indiana Senate where she has served for the past twenty-six years representing Indiana Senate District 3.

In particular, Senator Rogers has most recently served as the Indiana Senate Minority Whip, and as the Ranking Minority Member on the Education and Career Development Committee as well as the Family and Children Services Committee. Senator Rogers had also served on the Appropriations, Homeland Security and Transportation, Veterans Affairs and the Military, and Pensions and Labor Committees, and as a member of the Indiana Education Roundtable.

Since entering public service, Senator Rogers has established herself as one of Indiana's most accomplished and effective legislators, working across the aisle with her colleagues to improve the lives of all Hoosiers, notably to protect the safety, rights, and educational opportunities of our youngest citizens. In particular, Senator Rogers authored Jojo's Law, which mandates that all vehicles for ten or more passengers utilized by public schools, preschools, or licensed day care centers must meet the same safety standards as school buses. Senator Rogers also created Heather's Law, which requires the Indiana Department of Education to develop programs for Indiana schools to better educate students about dating violence. Moreover, she has led efforts to increase anti-bullying education statewide and safeguard our students from forms of harassment outside the classroom, such as cyberbullying. In addition, Earline Rogers was instrumental in the passage of legislation that raised the minimum age of the death penalty to 18 years of age in Indiana. Finally, Senator Rogers wrote Indiana's first bilingual-literacy program and successfully provided funding for Northwest Indiana school repair and prospective teacher training. Earline's record as an

advocate for our community's most vulnerable, and for preparing our next generation of leaders, has and will continue to leave an immeasurable impact on Northwest Indiana, our state, and our country.

In addition to her achievements in the realm of children and education, Senator Rogers' legislative accomplishments include filing the first bill to legalize casino and riverboat gaming in Indiana, spearheading efforts to increase job growth, and most recently, gaining legislative approval to relocate docked riverboat casinos to adjacent land. Thanks to the efforts of Senator Rogers, this industry has generated significant economic investment throughout our state. Furthermore, Senator Rogers was a leader and integral to the creation of the Northwest Indiana Regional Development Authority, an entity that currently works with local, state, and federal partners to spur regional economic development. These projects include the enrichment of the Gary/Chicago International Airport, improving access to our historic lakeshore through the Marquette Plan, investment in the recapitalization and expansion of the South Shore Rail Line, and the development of a regional bus system. Senator Rogers has fought to bring economic prosperity and opportunities to all of her constituents, and has been a transformational figure and the epitome of a public servant.

Earline is married to Chuck Rogers, a retired Gary firefighter, and together they have two children, Keith Sr. and Dara, as well as a number of grandchildren and great-grandchildren. Earline plans to spend her retirement staying active in the Gary community, including in Saint Timothy Community Church, where she has been a member for over fifty years, and looks forward to spending winters visiting her family in Arizona.

I am especially proud to note that the relationship between the Smith/Rogers and Visclosky families spans four generations. As mentioned earlier in my remarks, Earline's father worked two part-time jobs in addition to his full-time employment. One of those part-time positions was working with my father in the Calumet Township Trustee's office in the 1940s and 1950s. There they began a friendship based on a profound respect for each other. To this day, my 100-year-old father, John, is proud that he attended Earline's high school graduation open house and was able to witness the beginning of her distinguished academic and professional career. That friendship has continued through my relationship with Earline and Chuck, and now spans a fourth generation with her grandson, Keith, who is currently serving in my Washington, DC, Congressional office. The Visclosky family has been blessed to have experienced such a long standing and strong relationship with individuals imbued with integrity, selflessness, and with whom we have had countless good laughs.

I am proud to call Earline my friend, and I wish her the very best in this new chapter of her life. Earline has always served the citizens of Gary, Northwest Indiana, and our entire state as a passionate and compassionate public servant. For this she is worthy of the highest praise.

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully ask that you and my distinguished colleagues join me in honoring Indiana State Senator Earline Rogers for her life of public service, and for teaching generations of young Hoosiers to be a force for positive change, both in and out of the classroom. Senator Rogers' life has truly been a gift to us all.

IN RECOGNITION OF ACTION POTENTIAL

HON. PATRICK MEEHAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 8, 2016

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Action Potential on winning SCORE's 2016 Small Business Achievement Award.

SCORE is a national nonprofit that provides free business mentoring and educational workshops to entrepreneurs and small business owners across the country. I am grateful for the services local SCORE chapters provide for our region's innovative entrepreneurs. And I commend the Chester County Chapter on being named "2015 Chapter of the Year," edging out over 300 other chapters around the country.

Kathy Dixon and Kristen Wilson founded Action Potential in 2011 to provide innovative, high-customized rehabilitation services to senior, neurological and amputee clients. Action Potential is the first outpatient therapy provider to offer these specialized services in Delaware and Chester Counties. In just three years the business more than quadrupled its number of patients.

Kathy and Kristen have been involved with SCORE since they were first considering starting their own business, attending workshops that helped them develop a business plan and working with a SCORE counselor.

Action Potential is actively involved in and giving back to its community, hosting educational luncheon sessions for physicians and charity events like their National Amputee Golf Association First Swing Seminar and Annual Turkey Trot.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Kathy Dixon and Kristen Wilson on their success. It is small businesses like Action Potential that form the backbone of our local economy.

H.R. 5055, ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT OF 2017

HON. LYNN A. WESTMORELAND

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 8, 2016

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my deep concerns about the proactive management practices displayed by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Mobile District, in regard to their management of West Point Dam and Lake water levels. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers should use all appropriated funds to implement and carry out the best practices. For many years, my office and the stakeholders of West Point Lake have worked with the Mobile District to discuss proactive policies and what it will take to put adaptive management practices in place. Upon hearing the announcement that West Point Lake will not remain at full pool this summer as a direct result of the Mobile District's decision to draw down the lake, I once again am concerned that best practices are not being utilized. The construction of the West Point Dam was authorized by Congress through the Flood Control Act of 1962 and completed later in 1975. Of the five intended purposes for the West Point Dam and Lake, general recreation is chief among them. West Point Lake has served this historical purpose for over 40 years, contributing anywhere from $153 million to $710 million in annual economic impact. However, the economic impact depends heavily on the lake's water levels. West Point Lake guests enjoy fishing, boating, and other water sports, as well as many other outdoor activities centrally located around the lake. There can be no doubt that recreational activities on West Point Lake are the life-blood of the area. The threat of low water levels will have substantial impacts on recreation. I urge the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Mobile District to use all appropriated funds to implement adaptive management practices according to the general recreation purpose of West Point Dam and Lake.

RECOGNIZING MR. JOHN BREITSMAN UPON THE OCCASION OF HIS RETIREMENT FROM THE PENNSYLVANIA DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

HON. LOU BARLETTA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 8, 2016

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to recognize Mr. John Breitsman on the occasion of his retirement as the Director of the Bureau of Plant Industry at the Pennsylvania Department of Agriculture after 34 years of devoted service. Working every day to provide the best possible service to the consumers and producers of Pennsylvania's agriculture, John challenges his team to instill excellence and leadership in meeting the state's agricultural needs. Comprehensive oversight under John's leadership has improved agriculture significantly in my district and throughout Pennsylvania, ensuring a diverse and healthy ecosystem for generations to come.

Beginning his service to the state in 1982, John quickly advanced from an Agricultural Products Inspector to Agronomic Specialist, eventually holding the titles of Chief of the Division of Agronomic and Regional Services and Director of the Bureau of Plant Industry. His leadership and expertise have earned him positions with state, regional, national, and international organizations such as the Food and Drug Administration, the American Feed Control Officials (AAFCO) where he served as president, and the FBI. John has also worked closely with the Pennsylvania Department of Agriculture's Rapid Response Team, which is responsible for creating a Best Practices Manual for food and feed related emergency responses. His service and involvement with such diverse organizations has instilled a sense of security in my constituents' food supply and helped my district's farmers meet today's most daunting challenges.

John has always understood the value in surrounding himself with an elite team, mentoring his employees, and providing them with the support needed to fulfill the Bureau's mission of protecting Pennsylvania agriculture and

ensuring consumer safety. With such unique and committed service to his position and employees alike, John has received numerous awards highlighting his service. In 1999, he was recognized with the Pennsylvania Department of Agriculture's Outstanding Employee of the Year award and, in 2001, was honored with the AAFCO Distinguished Service Award. John has also been integral in the development of PaPlants, the Bureau's comprehensive web-based tracking and interactive constituent access program. PaPlants is now a model for USAPlants, a nationwide initiative in use by five other states.

Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to recognize Mr. John Breitsman for his extensive guidance and superior leadership with the Pennsylvania Department of Agriculture. Commitment to his colleagues has allowed John to inspire his coworkers on a daily basis, and his hard work is evident through various achievements and lasting contributions to my community and state. John's retirement will be accompanied by quality time spent with his wife Kristin and his daughter Stephanie. On behalf of my constituents, I wish Mr. John Breitsman well on the occasion of his retirement, and best of luck in his future endeavors.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. TAMMY DUCKWORTH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 8, 2016

Ms. DUCKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, on June 7, 2016, on Roll Call Number 269 on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to, as amended, H. Con. Res. 129, Expressing support for the goal of ensuring that all Holocaust victims live with dignity, comfort, and security in their remaining years, and urging the Federal Republic of Germany to reaffirm its commitment to this goal through a financial commitment to comprehensively address the unique health and welfare needs of vulnerable Holocaust victims, including home care and other medically prescribed needs, I am not recorded. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, as amended.

On June 7, 2016, on Roll Call Number 270 on the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 4906, To amend title 5, United States Code, to clarify the eligibility of employees of a land management agency in a time-limited appointment to compete for a permanent appointment at any Federal agency, and for other purposes, I am not recorded. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 4906.

On June 7, 2016, on Roll Call Number 271 on the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 4904, Making Electronic Government Accountable By Yielding Tangible Efficiencies Act of 2016, I am not recorded. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 4904.

On June 7, 2016, on Roll Call Number 272 on the motion to suspend the rules and pass, as amended, H.R. 1815, Eastern Nevada Land Implementation Improvement Act, I am not recorded. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 1815, as amended.

TRIBUTE TO LILA AND TED SHOESMITH

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 8, 2016

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Ted and Lila Shoesmith on the very special occasion of their 60th wedding anniversary.

Ted and Lila were married on May 27, 1956 and reside in Guthrie Center, Iowa. Their lifelong commitment to each other and their family truly embodies Iowa's values. As the years pass, may their love continue to grow even stronger and may they continue to love, cherish, and honor one another for many more years to come.

I commend this lovely couple on their 60 years of life together and I wish them many more. I know my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives will join me in congratulating them on this momentous occasion.

RECOGNIZING SYDNEY EISMEIER

HON. KEN BUCK

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 8, 2016

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Sydney Eismeier, a Military Appointee from Colorado's Fourth Congressional District. I believe our greatest assets are America's brave men and women in uniform. Sydney is making an incredible sacrifice for our country and deserves our utmost support for her service. It is with great pleasure that I give her my endorsement to attend this prestigious institution.

Our nation owes no greater debt of gratitude than to those who fight to protect our freedom and liberty. I commend Sydney and her family for their commitment. On behalf of the 4th Congressional District of Colorado, I extend my best wishes to Sydney.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to recognize Sydney as a Military Appointee for her commitment to protect and serve our nation.

THOMAS BERGMAN

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 8, 2016

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Thomas Bergman for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Thomas Bergman is a 12th grader at Stanley Lake High School and received this award because his determination and hard work have allowed him to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Thomas Bergman is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Thomas Bergman for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt he will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of his future accomplishments.

RECOGNIZING THE RETIREMENT OF DAVE BREIDINGER

HON. MICHAEL G. FITZPATRICK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 8, 2016

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the retirement of Dave Breidinger, a man of commitment and service.

Whether we speak of Dave Breidinger's accomplishments during his career with Comcast or in the community, Dave has served with unwavering dedication. On this special milestone of his retirement, we come to celebrate the positive impact that Dave had on so many people's lives.

Dave began his career managing a local franchise. He retires today as the Senior Vice President of Government Affairs for Comcast's Northeast Division States. I had the pleasure to work with Dave on federal government communication related issues. His contributions to Comcast have been unparalleled, as they have significantly expanded communication in the Northeast region.

Equally important to Dave's accomplishments at Comcast and his commitment to professional associations, is the extensive range of his community involvement. He has been involved with groups including the Rotary Club, Salvation Army, and the Boys and Girls Club.

Currently, he serves on numerous boards including the Bucks County Community College Foundation Board and the St. Mary Medical Center Advisory Board. Dave is also Chairman of the Board of Pearl S. Buck International which works to build better lives for children around the world—an organization located in my district which I have great pride representing in the United States House of Representatives.

In honor of his time, hard work, and selfless spirit, Dave has received a multitude of awards including the Rotary District 7510 ''Matty'' Mathewson Rotarian of the Year award, the Boy Scouts of America ''Spirit of America'' award, and leadership awards from the NJCTA, the CTAMDDC and from the Broadband Cable Association of Pennsylvania. He was also inducted into the Cable Television Pioneers for his instrumental part in the Cable Television Industry.

David Breidinger's 35 years of work for Comcast and outstanding leadership is deeply appreciated. We are grateful for David's commitment and service and know he will continue to inspire others in the Northampton Township and beyond.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. GEORGE HOLDING

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 8, 2016

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, I missed roll call vote 269, H. Con. Res. 129 expressing

support for the goal of ensuring that all Holocaust victims live with dignity, comfort, and security in their remaining years, and urging the Federal Republic of Germany to reaffirm its commitment to this goal through a financial commitment to comprehensively address the unique health and welfare needs of vulnerable Holocaust victims, including home care and other medically prescribed needs.

Had I been present, I would have voted Yea.

HONORING JACOB L. SALSBURY

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 8, 2016

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Jacob L. Salsbury. Jacob is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 1395, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Jacob has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Jacob has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Jacob has contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Jacob L. Salsbury for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. LUIS V. GUTIÉRREZ

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 8, 2016

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent in the House Chamber for votes on Tuesday, June 7, 2016. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea'' on roll call votes 269, 270, 271, and 272.

TRIBUTE TO THE ZIPP'S PIZZARIA

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 8, 2016

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Zipp's Pizzaria of Adair, Iowa for winning the 2016 Iowa Tourism Office's Pizza Madness Award from the Iowa Tourism Office.

Iowa Tourism Office announced their contest search for the best pizza in Iowa in mid-March 2016 and after nearly 15,000 entries, the votes cast named Zipp's Pizzaria, an iconic small establishment nestled in western Iowa. The one-time ''take out only'' pizza parlor is now a full service restaurant known statewide for its signature taco pizza.

This year's winning entrant was a local hometown café, like so many of those in Iowa. Zipp's Pizzaria has all the markings of a great pizza parlor—with extra helpings of community pride and dishing up a tailor-made private recipe for its specialty taco pizza. Owner Jim Zimmerline accepted the award, noting he is humbled by the attention but is willing to give away their winning philosophy: never skimp on the ingredients. He said, ''Not every pizza is the same. A lot of love goes into it. Everything is fresh.''

I commend Jim Zimmerline and the staff at Zipp's Pizzaria for creating an outstanding pizza. I urge my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives to join me in congratulating Zipp's Pizzaria for winning 2016 Iowa Tourism Office's Pizza Madness Award. I wish Jim and all of the staff nothing but the best.

RECOGNIZING GUSSIE GAMMON'S 90TH BIRTHDAY

HON. EARL L. "BUDDY" CARTER

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 8, 2016

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Gussie Gammon of St. Simons Island, Georgia for her 90th birthday on June 25th.

At 90 years old Ms. Gammon continues to be an impressive member and contributor to the coastal Georgia community.

She contributes greatly to the Coastal Georgia Republican Club in Brunswick and the Georgia Federation of Republican Women. She has even held positions of leadership including secretary of the Coastal Georgia Republican Club.

I know from the time that I have spent with her that she deeply cares about bettering her community as well as the nation.

Before moving to coastal Georgia in 2009, Gussie and her husband Don were active members of the community in Waynesville, North Carolina.

The First Congressional District of Georgia is lucky to have someone like Gussie who illustrates, each day, her dedication in creating a better community and I thank her for her service.

Ms. Gammon, I hope you have a happy 90th birthday.

RECOGNIZING THE LIFE AND SERVICE OF VINCENT ROTHWELL

HON. TOM REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 8, 2016

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker. I rise today to recognize the life and service of Vincent Rothwell, who recently passed away at the age of 91.

Mr. Rothwell was a long-time resident of Chautauqua County, New York. He graduated from Mayville High School in 1941 and joined the Army Air Corps in 1943. He served as a turret gunner aboard B–24 Bombers in the European Theater during World War II. After the war, he returned stateside and served as a Personnel Sergeant.

Mr. Rothwell was honorably discharged from the Army in 1946. He returned to New York and married the love of his life, Elizabeth ''Betty'' Pickard, later that year. Mr. Rothwell graduated from Houghton College in 1952 and the Evangelical Theology Seminar of Naperville, Illinois, in 1955. Two years after joining the ministry, he reenlisted in the Army as a chaplain. He served a deployment in Vietnam and presided over more than 1,500 funerals at Arlington National Cemetery. Mr. Rothwell attained the rank of Lt. Colonel and, in 1975 retired as Senior Chaplain after 22 years of service to his country.

Mr. Rothwell returned to Westfield in 1984, where he continued his ministry as a pastor at the Westfield United Methodist Church. Even in retirement, Mr. Rothwell tirelessly served his local community, as a member of the Chautauqua County Jail Chaplaincy, a Westfield Village Trustee, the Westfield Village Clerk, and the Westfield Volunteer Fire Department Chaplain. As a pillar of his community, Mr. Rothwell was admired and respected by everyone who knew him.

Vincent Rothwell dedicated his life to serving his country, his community, and his neighbors. I extend my sincerest condolences to his family and ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the life and service of this great American.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. CARLOS CURBELO

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 8, 2016

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on June 7, I missed votes on account of a flight delay from Miami to Washington, D.C. Had I been present I would have voted as follows:

Roll Call 269: I would have voted YEA: H. Con. Res. 129—Expressing support for the goal of ensuring that all Holocaust victims live with dignity, comfort, and security in their remaining years, and urging the Federal Republic of Germany to reaffirm its commitment to this goal through a financial commitment to comprehensively address the unique health and welfare needs of vulnerable Holocaust victims, including home care and other medically prescribed needs.

Roll Call: 270: I would have voted YEA: H.R. 4906—To amend title 5, United States Code, to clarify the eligibility of employees of a land management agency in a time-limited appointment to compete for a permanent appointment at any Federal agency, and for other purposes.

Roll Call: 271: I would have voted YEA: H.R. 4904—MEGABYTE Act.

Roll Call: 272: I would have voted YEA: H.R. 1815—Eastern Nevada Land Implementation Improvement Act.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ROBERT PITTENGER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 8, 2016

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, on Roll Call Votes Number 269, 270, 271, and 272 I am not recorded because I was absent from the U.S. House of Representatives. Had I been

present, I would have voted in the following manner:

On Roll Call Number 269. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA.

On Roll Call Number 270. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA.

On Roll Call Number 271. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA.

On Roll Call Number 272. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA.

TRIBUTE TO EVANELL AND ARTHUR WHITWORTH

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 8, 2016

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor Evanell and Arthur Whitworth on the very special occasion of their 65th wedding anniversary.

Arthur and Evanell were married on June 12, 1951 and reside in Winterset, Iowa. Their lifelong commitment to each other and their family truly embodies Iowa's values. As the years pass, may their love continue to grow even stronger and may they continue to love, cherish, and honor one another for many more years to come.

I commend this lovely couple on their 65 years of life together and I wish them many more. I know my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives will join me in congratulating them on this momentous occasion.

TRIBUTE TO MR. DANNY JONES, ASST. CHIEF, CLEARWATER FIRE DEPARTMENT

HON. DAVID W. JOLLY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 8, 2016

Mr. JOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize Danny Jones who has dedicated nearly 30 years of service to his community and whose selfless work continues to inspire all those around him.

Mr. Jones retired on May 24, 2016 as Assistant Fire Chief of the Clearwater Fire Department. He spent his career aiding and assisting the people of Pinellas County where he was known for his dedication to the job and commitment to his coworkers and community.

Mr. Jones led the Clearwater Fire Department with a heartfelt smile and enthusiastic attitude, comforting individuals and families who needed his assistance, and guiding the members of his team who relied on his thoughtful guidance while responding to dangerous situations.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank and acknowledge Mr. Jones for his dedicated service to Pinellas County and our beloved community. He has made an impact on the Tampa Bay area, and I ask that this body join me in recognizing his service and congratulating him on his career. I wish him the best of luck as he begins a new chapter in his life.

TASMYN DOWD

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 8, 2016

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Tasmyn Dowd for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Tasmyn Dowd is an 8th grader at Oberon Middle School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Tasmyn Dowd is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Tasmyn Dowd for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BILL PASCRELL, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 8, 2016

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I want to state that on June 7, 2016, I missed four roll call votes due to prior commitments in my district. Had I been present I would have voted:

YES—Roll Call Vote 269—H. Con. Res. 129—Expressing support for the goal of ensuring that all Holocaust victims live with dignity, comfort, and security in their remaining years, and urging the Federal Republic of Germany to reaffirm its commitment to this goal through a financial commitment to comprehensively address the unique health and welfare needs of vulnerable Holocaust victims, including home care and other medically prescribed needs.

YES—Roll Call Vote 270—H.R. 4906—To amend title 5, United States Code, to clarify the eligibility of employees of a land management agency in a time-limited appointment to compete for a permanent appointment at any Federal agency.

YES—Roll Call Vote 271—H.R. 4904—Making Electronic Government Accountable by Yielding Tangible Efficiencies Act of 2016

YES—Roll Call Vote 272—H.R. 1815—Eastern Nevada Land Implementation Improvement Act

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BARBARA LEE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 8, 2016

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, if I was present on Tuesday, June 7, 2016 for Congressional votes I would have voted the following ways:

H. Con. Res. 129—YES

H.R. 4906—YES

H.R. 4904—YES

H.R. 1815—YES

CELEBRATING THE RETIREMENT OF STATE REPRESENTATIVE MARY FRITZ

HON. ELIZABETH H. ESTY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 8, 2016

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the legacy of State Representative Mary Fritz, who will be retiring from the Connecticut House of Representatives. Rep. Fritz's retirement will mark the conclusion of her fifteenth term and more than three decades of public service. As a member of the Connecticut House of Representatives, Rep. Fritz has worked tirelessly on behalf of the citizens of Cheshire and Wallingford.

Rep. Fritz began a lifetime of public service on the Board of Education in the Town of Wallingford, Connecticut. In November of 1982, Rep. Fritz was first elected to represent the 90th District in the Connecticut General Assembly. Since Rep. Fritz's inaugural term, she has established herself as a consummate leader, serving as Deputy Majority Leader, Deputy Speaker, and Assistant Deputy Speaker over the course of her long and distinguished tenure.

As a legislator, Rep. Fritz has successfully pushed for and passed legislation on a broad array of issues including crime, education, healthcare, senior care, and taxation. During her first term, Rep. Fritz helped establish high school graduation requirements that called for Connecticut high school students to complete a course in civics. This marked the first of many hard-won reforms through which she enriched the lives of her constituents and strengthened our community.

It gives me great pleasure to recognize the service of my friend and former colleague, State Representative Mary Fritz. On behalf of the United States House of Representatives, I thank her and wish her the very best in retirement.

TRIBUTE TO TIM CAPPEL

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 8, 2016

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor and congratulate Tim Cappel of Atlantic, Iowa, for his selection by the Young Professionals of Atlantic for the Young Professional Business Leader Award. Tim Cappel is associated with Cappel's Ace Hardware in Atlantic.

Tim was selected for this honor because he has been a long-standing member of the Atlantic community and demonstrates exceptional leadership as well as positive business practices in his family-owned business. He takes an active role in the Atlantic community by serving as an EMT and Assistant Fire Chief for the Atlantic Fire Department, Treasurer for the Cass County Fire Association and assists with fundraisers for the Shrine Burn Center.

I applaud and congratulate Tim Cappel for earning this award. He is a shining example of

how hard work and dedication can affect the future of a community and business. I urge my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives to join me in congratulating Tim Cappel for his many accomplishments and for his service to the Atlantic community. I wish him continued success in all his future endeavors.

IN RECOGNITION OF ALEX MELNIKOW'S RETIREMENT

HON. BARBARA COMSTOCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 8, 2016

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to use this time to recognize the tremendous work of my constituent Mr. Alex Melnikow of Clifton, Virginia. Mr. Melnikow retired on February 3rd, 2016, after over 40 years of service to the United States. His dedication to a high standard of conduct allowed him to remain honest and loyal, and allowed him to make a positive impact to the efficiency in our armed services.

During his most recent assignment, Mr. Melnikow served as the lead analyst for Diminishing Manufacturing Sources and Material Shortages (DMSMS) within the Office of the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Systems Engineering, Engineering Enterprise, and Defense Standardization Program Office. Mr. Melnikow strove to enhance the efficiency of engineering practices such as operational support, alliance forces interoperability, material configuration, training development and outreach.

In addition to his time at DMSMS, Mr. Melnikow served for 25 years as a logistics program manager for the Defense Logistics Agency, as well as 7 years with the Tennessee Valley Authority as an acquisition program manager. He served as a senior staff engineer for the Defense Logistics Agency in the Logistics Research and Development Program. In 2007, he received the Defense Logistics Agency's Outstanding Program Manager Award as a result of his efforts on the electronics availability program. These experiences all contributed to his impressive technical background as a test engineer and as a senior program manager.

Mr. Speaker, I now ask that my colleagues join me in thanking Mr. Alex Melnikow for the outstanding services he provided to the United States throughout his long-lasting career. I wish him all the best in his future endeavors.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JOSEPH CROWLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 8, 2016

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, on June 7, 2016, due to a weather-related travel delay I was absent for recorded votes No. 269, No. 270, No. 271 and No. 272.

I would like to reflect how I would have voted if I were here:

On Roll Call No. 269 I would have voted yes.

On Roll Call No. 270 I would have voted yes.

On Roll Call No. 271 I would have voted yes.

On Roll Call No. 272 I would have voted yes.

HONORING NATHAN WIRT

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 8, 2016

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Nathan Wirt. Nathan is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 1099, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Nathan has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Nathan has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Nathan has contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Nathan Wirt for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

TRIBUTE TO DANNY WEBER, FIREFIGHTER OF THE YEAR

HON. DAVID W. JOLLY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 8, 2016

Mr. JOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize a hero in our community, Danny Weber, who was recently named East Lake Firefighter of the Year.

Mr. Weber has been a firefighter-paramedic for seven years, and has served Pinellas County since 2014. Mr. Weber has dedicated his life to assisting individuals and families in our community, but one story in particular demonstrates his courage and selflessness, and inspired his selection as Firefighter of the Year.

On June 12, 2015, a woman lost control of her vehicle and drove into a large pond. Shortly after, the East Lake Fire Rescue arrived on the scene, and Mr. Weber wasted no time making his way to the woman trapped inside of her vehicle. He rescued the woman from inside the sinking car and pulled her to safety. Selfless acts like this one are truly heroic.

This is not the first time Mr. Weber has been recognized for his service. Mr. Weber also won the Morroni Award as the Pinellas County Firefighter of the Year. I am grateful that Mr. Weber is part of our community and continues to make a difference. I ask that this body join me in recognizing Mr. Weber for his service to Pinellas County.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BETO O'ROURKE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 8, 2016

Mr. O'ROURKE. Mr. Speaker, during the roll call votes on Monday, May 23, 2016 through Thursday, May 27, 2016, I was absent due to an invitation from the President to join him on his trip to Vietnam.

Had I been present, on roll call number 229, I would have voted Nay.

On roll call number 230, I would have voted Yea.

On roll call number 231, I would have voted Nay.

On roll call number 232, I would have voted Nay.

On roll call number 233, I would have voted Nay.

On roll call number 234, I would have voted Nay.

On roll call number 235, I would have voted Nay.

On roll call number 236, I would have voted Yea.

On roll call number 237, I would have voted Nay.

On roll call number 238, I would have voted Yea.

On roll call number 239, I would have voted Nay.

On roll call number 240, I would have voted Nay.

On roll call number 241, I would have voted Nay.

On roll call number 242, I would have voted Yea.

On roll call number 243, I would have voted Nay.

On roll call number 244, I would have voted Nay.

On roll call number 245, I would have voted Yea.

On roll call number 246, I would have voted Nay.

On roll call number 247, I would have voted Yea.

On roll call number 248, 1 would have voted Nay.

On roll call number 249, I would have voted Yea.

On roll call number 250, I would have voted Nay.

On roll call number 251, I would have voted Nay.

On roll call number 252, I would have voted Yea.

On roll call number 253, I would have voted Yea.

On roll call number 254, I would have voted Yea.

On roll call number 255, I would have voted Nay.

On roll call number 256, I would have voted Nay.

On roll call number 257, I would have voted Yea.

On roll call number 258, I would have voted Yea.

On roll call number 259, I would have voted Nay.

On roll call number 260, I would have voted Nay.

On roll call number 261, I would have voted Nay.

On roll call number 262, I would have voted Nay.
On roll call number 263, I would have voted Nay.
On roll call number 264, I would have voted Yea.
On roll call number 265, I would have voted Yea.
On roll call number 266, I would have voted Nay.
On roll call number 267, I would have voted Nay.
On roll call number 268, I would have voted Nay.

TRIBUTE TO EAGLE SCOUT TYLER WHITEHEAD

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 8, 2016

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Tyler Whitehead of Norwalk, Iowa for achieving the rank of Eagle Scout. Tyler is a member of Boy Scout Troop 30. The Eagle Scout designation is the highest advancement rank in scouting. Approximately two percent of Boy Scouts earn the Eagle Scout Award. The award is a performance-based achievement with high standards that have been well-maintained over the past century.

To earn the Eagle Scout rank, a Boy Scout is obligated to pass specific tests that are organized by requirements and merit badges, as well as completing an Eagle Scout Project to benefit the community. For Tyler's project, he refurnished the landscaping near the entrance of the Norwalk Police Department, supervising volunteers who removed debris, landscaped and planted foliage to improve the area. He raised the required funds by creating a donation letter and augmenting that effort with personal solicitations to Norwalk business leaders who could see the vision of his project. Raising more money than needed for the landscaping project, Tyler donated the remainder to the D.A.R.E. program to educate young students against drug and alcohol usage.

The work ethic Tyler has shown in his Eagle Scout Project and every other project leading up to his Eagle Scout rank, speaks volumes about his commitment to serving a cause greater than himself and assisting his community.

Mr. Speaker, the example set by this young man and his supportive family and community demonstrates the rewards of hard work, dedication, and perseverance. I am honored to represent Tyler Whitehead and his family in the United States Congress. I know that all of my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives will join me in congratulating him on obtaining the Eagle Scout ranking, and I wish him continued success in his future education and career.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. GEORGE HOLDING

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 8, 2016

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, I missed roll call vote 270, H.R. 4906—to amend title 5, United States Code, to clarify the eligibility of employees of a land management agency in a time-limited appointment to compete for a permanent appointment at any Federal agency.

Had I been present, I would have voted Yea.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JOYCE BEATTY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 8, 2016

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately on June 7, 2016, I missed roll call votes 269, 270, 271, and 272.

On roll call vote 269, had I been present, I would have voted ''aye'' on final passage of H. Con. Res. 129, ''Expressing support for the goal of ensuring that all Holocaust victims live with dignity, comfort, and security in their remaining years, and urging the Federal Republic of Germany to reaffirm its commitment to this goal through a financial commitment to comprehensively address the unique health and welfare needs of vulnerable Holocaust victims, including home care and other medically prescribed needs.''

On roll call vote 270, had I been present, I would have voted ''aye'' on final passage of H.R. 4906, ''To amend title 5, United States Code, to clarify the eligibility of employees of a land management agency in a time-limited appointment to compete for a permanent appointment at any Federal agency, and for other purposes.''

On roll call vote 271, had I been present, I would have voted ''aye'' on final passage of H.R. 4904, ''Making Electronic Government Accountable By Yielding Tangible Efficiencies Act of 2016''.

On roll call vote 272, had I been present, I would have vote ''aye'' on final passage of H.R. 1815, ''Eastern Nevada Land Implementation Improvement Act''.

REMEMBERING JACK KRUMME OF OVERLAND PARK

HON. KEVIN YODER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 8, 2016

Mr. YODER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the service of a long-time member of my Military and Veterans' Advisory Committee, Jack Krumme, who passed away in April. Jack was drafted into the U.S. Army in 1950, serving as a corporal in the ordinance corps during the Korean War.

After Jack's service in the Army, he continued to serve our nation and our community as a member of the Board of Zoning Appeals in Overland Park. Even though he had left the service, Jack continued to work with and advocate on behalf of his fellow veterans, serving as commander of Korean War Veterans' Association, Chapter 181.

During his tenure as commander, he led the effort to raise funds to construct the Korean War Veterans' Memorial located in Overland Park. It was a truly proud moment for Jack when the memorial was finished.

For those of us who knew him, the memorial now stands as not only a testament to Korean War veterans, but also to Jack. He always wanted to make sure the service of all Korean War Veterans was acknowledged and ''not forgotten.'' It's a wonderful spot in our community.

Jack and I became close as he served on my veterans advisory committee doing so for more than five years. He always provided valuable insight and advice. His service, like the service of so many others, made it possible for our country to flourish and prosper.

Jack's willingness to serve and commitment to his fellow veterans reflects greatly on him as a soldier. His service will never be forgotten and he will remain, forever, a true patriot.

Mr. Speaker, the Third District lost a selfless and dedicated individual in Jack. He may be gone, but he will not be forgotten. My thoughts and prayers continue to be with Dolores and their wonderful family.

God Bless, Jack.

HONORING ELIANA JOY HERNDON

HON. JAMES B. RENACCI

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 8, 2016

Mr. RENACCI. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to congratulate my Tax Counsel, Randy Herndon and his wife Christie, on the birth of their daughter, Eliana Joy Herndon. Their bundle of joy was born at 9:25 PM, on June 7, 2016 and weighed 7 pounds, 11 ounces. I would also like to congratulate their children, Micah and Anya, on becoming big siblings who welcomed their baby sister to the world.

I am so excited for this new blessing to the Herndon family and wish them health and happiness.

TRIBUTE TO MAXINE AND LEE WHEELER, JR.

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 8, 2016

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor Maxine and Lee Wheeler, Jr. of Lorimor, Iowa, on the very special occasion of their 65th wedding anniversary. They were married on May 27, 1951.

Lee Jr. and Maxine's lifelong commitment to each other truly embodies Iowa values. As they reflect on their 65th anniversary, may their commitment grow even stronger as they continue to love, cherish, and honor one another for many years to come.

I salute this great couple on their 65th year together and I wish them many more memories. I know my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives will join me in congratulating them on this momentous occasion.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE RETIREMENT OF FRED SHELL

HON. DEBBIE DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 8, 2016

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Fred Shell on his retirement from

DTE Energy for his lifetime of distinguished service to our region and state.

A native of Essexville Michigan, Fred graduated from Garber High School in 1969 and attended Western Michigan University where he majored in History and Political Science. After college, Fred started in on a long and distinguished career in public service, working for both Congressman Paul Todd and Congressman Jim O'Hara before beginning a long career of providing gas and power to the State of Michigan.

Fred started at the Michigan Consolidated Gas Company in 1977 as the Assistant Manager of Media Relations. From that point forward, Fred has held a wide variety of positions, in public relations, media relations, public policy, and management at MichCon and G–Tech. In 2001, after the Detroit Edison and MichCon merger, Fred was named Vice President of Corporate and Government Affairs at DTE Energy. In this role, Fred has been a constant in the Michigan Government and Business scene, guiding policy that has improved the lives of Michigan's citizens and improved the environment for job creation in our state; we appreciate all that he has done to keep Michigan moving forward.

Fred has spent many years of his career involved in giving back. In 1998, as a testament to his hard work, he was named as the President of the MichCon Foundation. After the merger in 2001, Fred led the staff team and developed a strategic vision that combined the MichCon and Detroit Edison Foundations into the DTE Energy Foundation. Fred's leadership advanced the DTE Energy Foundation forward to become one of the most important foundations in our state. The foundation has supported a wide range of youth and cultural programming, as well as supporting basic human services. The Foundation's work of providing support to families in need during the great recession exemplified the extraordinary role that this foundation plays in our community, improving the lives of so many of our friends and neighbors.

Fred has personally gone above and beyond in his involvement with a wide variety of community organizations and non-profits. He has served as the president of the Michigan Economic Development Foundation, the Vice Chairman of the Metropolitan Affairs Coalition, as a board member of the Historical Society of Michigan, the Metro Detroit Visitors and Convention Bureau, the Michigan Political Leadership Program, and the Right Place of Grand Rapids, just to name a few. Our state has been enriched and advanced by Fred's commitment to volunteerism and community service.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me today to honor Fred Shell for his service to our State. I thank him for his leadership and wish him many years of success.

THE GUARDIANS

HON. MICHAEL G. FITZPATRICK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 8, 2016

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Guardians. All were affected by morcellation of an occult uterine cancer—and all lost their precious lives prematurely or unnecessarily, because of deadly defect in our medical device regulatory space.

Erica Kaitz, Danusia Bennett-Taber, Patricia Daley, Sally Newton, Sandra Brown, Mary Alyce Dolan, Nancy Lincoln Davis, Margie Miller, Barbara Leary, Lori Kauffman, Elizabeth Jacobson, Jenny Proffer, Linda Interlichia, Brenda Leuzzi, Vivianna Ruschitto, Martha Ariri, Nancy Curtis.

HONORING ANDREW H. STEWART

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 8, 2016

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Andrew H. Stewart. Andrew is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 1395, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Andrew has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Andrew has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Andrew has contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Andrew H. Stewart for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

TRIBUTE TO THE LIFE OF ROSE OBERTI PERACCHI

HON. JIM COSTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 8, 2016

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the life of Rose Oberti Peracchi, who recently passed away on May 26, 2016, at the age of 100. Rose was an extraordinary person, and she will always be remembered as a woman who lived her life with purpose and great dedication to her family, friends, and community.

Rose Peracchi was born on August 22, 1915 to Giacomo and Mary Nan Oberti on her family farm located near Sanger, California. She fell in love and married her teenage sweetheart, Gene Peracchi, early on in life, and together they worked hard, raised their two sons, Gene and Don, and took care of Rose's father, while remaining faithful to family, and her community.

Rose was a self-taught seamstress, establishing her own drapery business and contracting with West Coast Draperies until her retirement in 1977. As a business owner, she was a trailblazer in the industry, and although difficult at times to run a business and raise a family, her dedication and hard work helped her accomplish many successes. She will always be remembered for her culinary skills, an art form enjoyed by family and friends. Rose generously shared her skills, teaching first her sons, then her daughters-in-law and eventually her grandchildren in the art of Italian food preparation.

Rose's friendliness and genuine nature built many lasting friendships during her lifetime. Her long and remarkable life is fondly remembered by the countless friends and family who were fortunate to know her. Rose leaves behind her son Don and his wife Judy, grandchildren, and great grandchildren, and one great great grandchild. It is my honor to join her family in celebrating the life of this amazing woman, who will never be forgotten.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great respect that I ask my colleagues in the House of Representatives to pay tribute to the life of Rose Oberti Peracchi, whose genuine character and her loving commitment to her family and community will be greatly missed.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE CENTENNIAL ANNIVERSARY OF BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA TROOP ONE—SACRAMENTO

HON. DORIS O. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 8, 2016

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Boy Scouts of America (BSA) Troop One—Sacramento as the scouts, their families, leaders, and former scouts join together to celebrate their centennial anniversary. I ask all my colleagues to join me in honoring BSA Troop One for its dedication to service in our community on the occasion of the troop's "100 of One" celebration.

Troop One was officially formed in Sacramento in 1916, and is the oldest troop in the western United States. It was one of few Boy Scouts of America troops that remained active during World War II. The first Eagle Scout of Troop One, the late Charles "Muddy" Watters, Sr., was recognized in 1932. Since then, over 400 Troop One scouts have ascended to the rank of Eagle Scout. Troop One is active in molding young leaders in the Sacramento area. Through monthly wilderness adventures, service outings, and jamborees, the 88 current scouts of Troop One learn and maintain the troop's founding values: a commitment to ethics, behaving responsibly, and serving one's community.

For 100 years, Troop One has demonstrated an unyielding commitment to Sacramento's youth and its larger community. From founding Troop One Scoutmaster George W. Spilman, to current scoutmaster Christopher Tileston, Troop One Scoutmasters have dedicated themselves to cultivating scouts into outstanding citizens. In turn, Troop One scouts have worked hard to better Sacramento. Sacramento is a better place thanks to the service and commitment of Troop One's scouts.

Mr. Speaker, as Troop One celebrates its 100th anniversary, I ask all my colleagues to join me in honoring the troop and its contribution to Sacramento's youth.

TRIBUTE TO VERNE WELCH

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 8, 2016

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Verne Welch of Council Bluffs, Iowa for his many years of dedicated service to the City of Council Bluffs and Pottawattamie County. Verne Welch is a Council Bluffs native who never forgot where he came from.

Verne Welch graduated from Thomas Jefferson High School in 1955. He served in the U.S. Navy from 1955 to 1968. Upon discharge, he joined a California recruitment firm for oversees contractors. In 1972 he joined Harrah's, Inc. and remained with the company until 1987. He felt a need to help his hometown during some tough economic times so in 1988, Verne Welch returned to Council Bluffs, establishing gaming in Iowa, working tirelessly to develop the industry in Council Bluffs.

Former Council Bluffs Mayor Tom Hanafan described Verne as ''the guy who came home and changed the face of his hometown community.'' Tom Schmitt, the publisher of the Daily Nonpareil, said, ''Verne Welch's actions to revitalize his hometown have brought a lot of changes to this community. If there was ever a person who could say, 'This is what I have done,' it would be Verne Welch—and he never says that.'' Because of Verne's active community service, he has created a legacy second to none. Verne Welch's endless dedication, commitment, generosity, and leadership for Council Bluffs has enhanced and improved the quality of life for his community and its citizens.

I commend and congratulate Verne Welch for making a difference in his hometown and influencing the economic future of Council Bluffs and the State of Iowa. I salute his many accomplishments and dedication for serving his community. I am proud to represent him in the United States Congress. I know that my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives join me in congratulating Verne Welch and wishing him the very best in the future.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. GEORGE HOLDING

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 8, 2016

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, I missed roll call 271, H.R. 4904—MEGABYTE Act of 2016.

Had I been present, I would have voted Yea.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 8, 2016

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was $10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is $19,220,484,557,364.60. We've added $8,593,607,508,451.52 to our debt in 6 years. This is over $8.5 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

RECOGNIZING ADAM KRATT

HON. KEN BUCK

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 8, 2016

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Adam Kratt, a Military Appointee from Colorado's Fourth Congressional district. I believe our greatest assets are America's brave men and women in uniform. Adam is making an incredible sacrifice for our country and deserves our utmost support for his service. It is with great pleasure that I give him my endorsement to attend this prestigious institution.

Our nation owes no greater debt of gratitude than to those who fight to protect our freedom and liberty. I commend Adam and his family for their commitment. On behalf of the 4th Congressional District of Colorado, I extend my best wishes to Adam.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to recognize Adam as a Military Appointee for his commitment to protect and serve our nation.

RECOGNIZING DR. VIRGINIA CARSON

HON. EARL L. "BUDDY" CARTER

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 8, 2016

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Dr. Virginia Carson and her retirement as President of South Georgia State College on June 30.

A graduate of the University of Georgia with Master's and Doctorate degrees from Georgia State University, Dr. Carson is no stranger to success.

During her 8 year tenure as President of South Georgia State College, she showed an unbelievable commitment to fostering her students' ambition and educational growth.

This dedication to her students has been instrumental to the success of the college and has ensured her students' success for years to come.

Dr. Carson prided herself on keeping a tightknit community with small class sizes and encouraging students to engage in extracurricular activities, which also enhanced campus life.

Although the true importance of Dr. Carson's service cannot be measured, I am honored to congratulate her for her hard work and dedication to higher education.

TRIBUTE TO TS BANK OF IOWA

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 8, 2016

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor and congratulate TS Bank of Atlantic, Iowa, for being selected by the Young Professionals of Atlantic for the Young Professional Choice Workplace Service Award. TS Bank's branch is located in Atlantic with its headquarters in Treynor, Iowa.

TS bank has a reputation for attracting, hiring, retaining, developing, and training young professionals. The bank has a mission to ignite prosperity by working together every day to create a positive impact on their clients and communities that they serve. TS Bank takes great pride in reinvesting in local communities, impacting local initiatives, supporting and sponsoring local community events, providing needed funds and resources for local nonprofits. TS Bank has a history of 80 percent employees volunteering in their communities.

I applaud and congratulate TS Bank for earning this award. TS Bank is a shining example of how hard work and dedication can affect the future of a community and its businesses. I urge my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives to join me in congratulating TS Bank for its many accomplishments and for the services it provides to Atlantic and southwest Iowa. I wish TS Bank and its employees continued success in all their future endeavors.

RECOGNIZING JAIRAM HATHWAR

HON. TOM REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 8, 2016

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Jairam Hathwar on winning the 2016 Scripps National Spelling Bee. Jairam was crowned co-champion after correctly spelling Feldenkrais in the final round of the competition.

Jairam is a seventh-grade student at the Alternative School for Math and Science in my hometown of Corning, New York. He participated in the National Spelling Bee for the second year in a row; after barely missing the finals last year, Jairam outlasted 285 other contestants en route to his first place finish this year.

Jairam's achievement is a testament to his work ethic, dedication to learning, and commitment to reaching his highest potential. After spending countless hours studying complex definitions, parts of speech, and languages of origin, he correctly spelled several of the most challenging words in the English language. Despite the high level of difficulty, Jairam demonstrated confidence and composure throughout the competition. Most importantly, he treated his fellow competitors with respect and showed humility and sportsmanship from the first word to the last.

Jairam Hathwar is a remarkable young man with an incredibly bright future ahead of him. I ask all of my colleagues to join me in congratulating Jairam on this remarkable accomplishment and wishing him the best in his future endeavors.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JEFF MILLER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 8, 2016

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, due to being unavoidably detained, I missed the following Roll Call Vote: No. 273 on June 7, 2016.

If present, I would have voted:

Roll Call Vote No. 273—On Ordering the Previous Question, "AYE."

RECOGNIZING CHARLES W. EARLE STEM ELEMENTARY SCHOOL CHESS TEAM

HON. DANNY K. DAVIS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 8, 2016

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the outstanding efforts of the Charles W. Earle STEM Elementary School's Chess Team.

Earle STEM Elementary School is among the top elementary school chess teams in Chicago. Considering this small school is located in a crime-prone area in the Englewood neighborhood of my Congressional District, I am very pleased of the involvement and leadership of chess Coach Joseph M. Ocol and the many leaders at the school. I would like to acknowledge the contributions of the Earle STEM School Principal, Cederall Petties, and Assistant Principal Elwanda Butler, along with the help Network 11 Chief Megan Hougard, the families and parents in the Local School Council Community headed by Darlene O'Banner.

On Sunday, April 24th, 2016, the all-girls chess team of Earle STEM Elementary School won 1st Place in the 2016 All-Girls National Chess Tournament. Out of 65 schools and 450 female students from all over the USA, only four CPS schools qualified to form an all-girl, grade sixth to eighth, chess team to compete in this biggest all-girl national chess tournament in the USA. The Earle STEM all-girls chess team was one of only two all-African American girls' chess team in that 2016 All-Girls National Chess Toumament.

Another notable victory for the Earle STEM Chess Team, composed this time of boys and girls from grades fourth to eighth, took place at the 2016 National Junior High School Championship where they won the 5th Place Trophy. This tournament was held at Marriott Hotel in Indianapolis, Indiana, April 15 to 17. With more than a hundred schools and about 2,000 students from all over the country competing, this is considered the biggest junior high school chess tournament in the USA.

Six months into the 2015–2016 academic year, and during its initial year as a chess team, the Earle STEM Elementary School Chess Team garnered five 1st Place team trophies, including a 4th Place trophy in the State of Illinois chess championship, and a 3rd Place Chicago Public Schools academic chess trophy.

At its inception, the Earle STEM Elementary School Chess Team members started mentoring one another on the rudiments of chess then advanced the mentoring program from Grade 8 to the kindergarten program. Allowing the 40 students of the chess and math club the capacity to participate after school and on Saturdays; the Earle STEM mentoring program has been effective in getting kids to mentor one another whilst competing against each other. This provides the most economical way of mastering skills and yet offering opportunities for students to be productive after school instead of being in the streets.

In closing, the Charles W. Earle STEM Elementary School's Chess Team is a prime example of students excelling beyond their environment and striving for excellence. Congratulations to the children of Earle Stem: Joshua Johnson, Erik Tolbert, Brandon Burgess, Taahir Levi, Tamaya Fultz, Breanna Shaw, Gavin Harry, Semaj Lowe, Xavier Rosado, Angelique Wilson, Monique Williams, Gelita Woodlow, Devion Dukes, Tyrone Dellar and Shawn Palmer. I am proud to acknowledge the school and these students for their achievements and I look forward to hearing about their great works for years to come.

TRIBUTE TO CAROL AND JACK SWANGER

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 8, 2016

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor Carol and Jack Swanger of Council Bluffs, Iowa, on the very special occasion of their 50th wedding anniversary. They were married in 1966. Carol is retired from Risen Son Christian Village and is active in the Red Hats and other women's group at Southside Christian Church. Jack is retired from Campbell's Soup Company, enjoys being a score keeper for local athletic teams, and volunteers at the food pantry at the Southside Christian Church.

Carol and Jack's lifelong commitment to each other and their family truly embodies Iowa values. As they reflect on their 50th anniversary may their commitment grow even stronger, as they continue to love, cherish, and honor one another for many years to come.

I commend this great couple on their 50th year together and I wish them many more. I know my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives join me in congratulating Carol and Jack Swanger on this momentous occasion.

HONORING MISHAWAKA FIRE CHIEF DALE FREEMAN FOR A DISTINGUISHED CAREER IN PUBLIC SERVICE

HON. JACKIE WALORSKI

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 8, 2016

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Fire Chief Dale Freeman and honor him for a selfless career serving Hoosiers throughout Mishawaka.

Chief Freeman began his storied journey with the Mishawaka Fire Department 36 years ago. Since then, he has gone on to lead the brave men and women who protect members of the northern Indiana community on a daily basis, responding to their calls for both emergency medical assistance and fire rescue. As chief, Freeman's rise has been marked by incredible dedication and perseverance.

His commitment to excellence just recently resulted in over 5,100 people, mostly children, receiving critical fire safety education through "Survive Alive House," Little Red, and other local programs and school assemblies. Furthermore, under Chief Freeman's leadership, more than half of Mishawaka's firefighting force is now cross-trained as Emergency Medical Technicians. These efforts have significantly strengthened the northern Indiana community's level of preparedness, allowing Hoosiers throughout Mishawaka to feel safe knowing that their local fire department is ready to respond at a moment's notice.

Chief Freeman's passion for serving the greater good is truly remarkable and deserves the praise of many. His continued dedication to aiding those in desperate need of assistance has undoubtedly reduced significant cases of fire-related injuries, deaths, and property damage. Since first joining the Mishawaka Fire Department, Chief Freeman has truly epitomized the ideal of servant leadership. On behalf of Hoosiers in the Second Congressional District, it is my honor to thank him for his service and sacrifice for our community.

INTRODUCING THE STOP, OBSERVE, ASK AND RESPOND (SOAR) TO HEALTH WELLNESS ACT

HON. STEVE COHEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 8, 2016

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, today, I introduced the Stop, Observe, Ask and Respond (SOAR) to Health and Wellness Act along with my colleagues Representatives ADAM KINZINGER, TONY CÁRDENAS and ANN WAGNER. It is a companion to S. 1446, which was introduced by Senators HEIDI HEITKAMP and SUSAN COLLINS. This bipartisan bill supports efforts underway at the Department of Health and Human Services to combat human trafficking by directing the Secretary to establish a pilot program to be known as 'Stop, Observe, Ask and Respond to Health and Wellness Training' to provide training on human trafficking to health care providers at all levels.

Human trafficking is a modern-day form of slavery that uses force, fraud or coercion to lure millions of men, women and children in countries around the world annually, including here in the United States. Human trafficking includes both sex and labor trafficking, and generates billions of dollars in profits each year, making it the second most profitable form of transnational crime behind drug trafficking.

Recognizing the key indicators of human trafficking is the first step in identifying victims, providing life-saving help and bringing traffickers to justice. Human trafficking, however, is a hidden crime and victims rarely seek help because of cultural barriers or out of fear of their traffickers or law enforcement.

While victims are often difficult to identify, a reported 68 percent of trafficking victims end

up in a health care setting at some point while being exploited, including in clinics, emergency rooms and doctor's offices. Despite this, out of more than 5,680 hospitals in the country, only 60 have been identified as having a plan for treating patients who are victims of trafficking and 95 percent of emergency room personnel are not trained to treat trafficking victims.

Our bill aims to ensure health care professionals are trained to identify and assist victims of human trafficking, and help close the gap in health care settings without plans for treating trafficking victims. I want to urge my colleagues to pass this important legislation so that health care professionals can better identify trafficking victims, provide victim centered care and help bring perpetrators of human trafficking to justice with the help of law enforcement as well as social and victims service agencies and organizations.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. GEORGE HOLDING

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 8, 2016

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, I missed roll call 272, H.R. 1815—Eastern Nevada Land Implementation Improvement Act.

Had I been present, I would have voted Yea.

TRIBUTE TO CHRISTOPHER GIBBS, SENIOR CHIEF PETTY OFFICER

HON. DAVID W. JOLLY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 8, 2016

Mr. JOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize Senior Chief Petty Officer Christopher Gibbs for his duty and service to Pinellas County and to our country.

On May 4, 2016 Officer Gibbs returned home after a year-long deployment and 21 years of military service. While enlisted, served as a Senior Chief Master at Arms and eventually earned the title of Senior Chief Petty Officer. We are eternally grateful for his service overseas.

Since returning home, Officer Gibbs continued his dedication to serving others through his work as an officer with the Pinellas Park Police Department.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Senior Chief Petty Officer Christopher Gibbs for his service to our community and this country. Pinellas Park is a safer place with him protecting us and we are very grateful and appreciative of his efforts. I ask this body to join me in recognizing Officer Gibbs' efforts and expressing our appreciation for his service.

May God bless Officer Gibbs and his family.

TRIBUTE TO CASEY BLAKE

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 8, 2016

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Casey Blake of Indianola, Iowa, for receiving the 2016 Robert D. Ray Pillar of Character Award from The Robert D. and Billie Ray Center in Des Moines, Iowa. The Award is given to those who live a life full of good character and foster greater character in others. This nonprofit organization, formerly known as Character Counts in Iowa, was created in 1997 by former Iowa Governor Robert D. Ray and former First Lady Billie Ray. It showcases humanitarian and civility endeavors impacting Iowans. The six character pillars are: trustworthiness, respect, responsibility, fairness, caring and citizenship.

Mr. Blake and his wife Abbie, as well as their six children, reside in Indianola, Iowa but for 13 years, he was defined a professional baseball player for several teams including Toronto Blue Jays, Minnesota Twins, Baltimore Orioles, Cleveland Indians, Los Angeles Dodgers and the Colorado Rockies organizations. Upon his retirement, the family returned home to Iowa and his hometown of Indianola. In 2010, they founded the Indianola Community Youth Foundation, built the Blake Fieldhouse and other community athletic complexes. Mr. Blake was inducted into the National High School Hall of Fame in 2014 and the Iowa High School Baseball Coaches Association Hall of Fame in 2016.

I applaud and congratulate Casey Blake as a shining example of how hard work, determination, and dedication can affect the future of a community. It is with great honor that I recognize him today. I know that my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives join me in honoring his accomplishments. I wish him continued success in his future endeavors.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, June 9, 2016 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

JUNE 14

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Appropriations

Subcommittee on Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies

Business meeting to markup an original bill entitled, ''Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, Fiscal Year 2017''.

SD–124

10 a.m.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

To hold an oversight hearing to examine the Securities and Exchange Commission.

SD–538

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings to examine oil and gas pipeline infrastructure and the economic, safety, environmental, permitting, construction, and maintenance considerations associated with that infrastructure.

SD–366

Committee on Finance

To hold hearings to examine energy tax policy in 2016 and beyond.

SD–215

3 p.m.

Committee on Environment and Public Works

Subcommittee on Superfund, Waste Management, and Regulatory Oversight

To hold an oversight hearing to examine the Environmental Protection Agency's progress in implementing Inspector General and Government Accountability Office recommendations.

SD–406

JUNE 15

10 a.m.

Committee on Appropriations

Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government

Business meeting to markup an original bill entitled, ''Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Act, Fiscal Year 2017''.

SD–138

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

Business meeting to consider pending calendar business.

SR–253

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

To hold hearings to examine implementing the Child Care Development Block Grant Act of 2014, focusing on perspectives of stakeholders.

SD–430

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

To hold hearings to examine America's insatiable demand for drugs, focusing on examining solutions.

SD–342

2 p.m.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

Subcommittee on Oceans, Atmosphere, Fisheries, and Coast Guard

To hold hearings to examine assessing the Coast Guard's increasing duties, focusing on drug and migrant interdiction.

SR–253

Committee on Finance

To hold hearings to examine challenges and opportunities for United States business in the digital age.

SD–215

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

Subcommittee on National Parks

To hold hearings to examine S. 2839 and H.R. 3004, bills to amend the Gullah/Geechee Cultural Heritage Act to extend the authorization for the Gullah/

Geechee Cultural Heritage Corridor Commission, H.R. 3036, to designate the National September 11 Memorial located at the World Trade Center site in New York City, New York, as a national memorial, H.R. 3620, to amend the Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area Improvement Act to provide access to certain vehicles serving residents of municipalities adjacent to the Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area, H.R. 4119, to authorize the exchange of certain land located in Gulf Islands National Seashore, Jackson County, Mississippi, between the National Park Service and the Veterans of Foreign Wars, S. 211, to establish the Susquehanna Gateway National Heritage Area in the State of Pennsylvania, S. 630, to establish the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta National Heritage Area, S. 1007, to amend the Dayton Aviation Heritage Preservation Act of 1992 to rename a site of the Dayton Aviation Heritage National Historical Park, S. 1623, to establish the Maritime Washington National Heritage Area in the State of Washington, S. 1662, to include Livingston County, the city of Jonesboro in Union County, and the city of Freeport in Stephenson County, Illinois, to the Lincoln National Heritage Area, S. 1690, to establish the Mountains to Sound Greenway National Heritage Area in the State of Washington, S. 1696 and H.R. 482, bills to redesignate the Ocmulgee National Monument in the State of Georgia, to revise the boundary of that monument, S. 1824, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study to assess the suitability and feasibility of designating certain land as the Finger Lakes National Heritage Area, S. 2087, to modify the boundary of the Fort Scott National Historic Site in the State of Kansas, S. 2412, to establish the Tule Lake National Historic Site in the State of California, S. 2548, to establish the 400 Years of African-American History Commission, S. 2627, to adjust the boundary of the Mojave National Preserve, S. 2807, to amend title 54, United States Code, to require State approval before the Secretary of the Interior restricts access to waters under the jurisdiction of the National Park Service for recreational or commercial fishing, S. 2805, to modify the boundary of Voyageurs National Park in the State of Minnesota, S. 2923, to redesignate the Saint-Gaudens National Historic Site as the ''Saint-Gaudens National Park for the Arts'', S. 2954, to establish the Ste. Genevieve National Historic Site in the State of Missouri, S. 3020, to update the map of, and modify the acreage available for inclusion in, the Florissant Fossil Beds National Monument, S. 3027, to clarify the boundary of Acadia National Park, and S. 3028, to redesignate the Olympic Wilderness as the Daniel J. Evans Wilderness.

SD–366

Special Committee on Aging

To hold hearings to examine innovations to promote Americans' financial security.

SD–562

JUNE 16

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Foreign Relations

To hold hearings to examine our evolving understanding and response to transnational criminal threats.

SD–419

10 a.m.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

Subcommittee on Regulatory Affairs and Federal Management

To hold hearings to examine reviewing the rulemaking records of independent regulatory agencies.

SD–342

JUNE 21

10 a.m.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

To hold hearings to examine the semi-annual monetary policy report to the Congress.

SH–216

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

Subcommittee on Public Lands, Forests, and Mining

To hold an oversight hearing to examine the Bureau of Land Management's Planning 2.0 initiative.

SD–366

JULY 13

10:30 a.m.

Committee on Appropriations

Subcommittee on Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies

To hold hearings to examine a review of the Department of Veterans Affairs' electronic health record (VistA), progress toward interoperability with the Department of Defense's electronic health record, and plans for the future.

SD–124

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

House and Senate met in a Joint Meeting to receive His Excellency Narendra Modi, Prime Minister of India.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S3599–S3665

Measures Introduced: Nine bills were introduced, as follows: S. 3030–3038. **Pages S3645–46**

Measures Reported:

Special Report entitled "Further Revised Allocation to Subcommittees of Budget Totals for Fiscal Years 2016 and 2017". (S. Rept. No. 114–273)

S. 1935, to require the Secretary of Commerce to undertake certain activities to support waterfront community revitalization and resiliency, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. (S. Rept. No. 114–272) **Page S3645**

Measures Considered:

National Defense Authorization Act—Agreement: Senate continued consideration of S. 2943, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, taking action on the following amendments proposed thereto:

Pages S3601–04, S3604

Pending:

McCain Amendment No. 4229, to address unfunded priorities of the Armed Forces. **Pages S3601–04**

Reed/Mikulski Amendment No. 4549 (to Amendment No. 4229), to authorize parity for defense and nondefense spending pursuant to the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2015. **Pages S3601–04**

A motion was entered to close further debate on the bill, and, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a vote on cloture will occur upon disposition of McCain Amendment No. 4229. **Page S3635**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the bill at approximately 9:30 a.m., on Thursday, June 9, 2016; that notwithstanding the provisions of rule XXII, the cloture motions with respect to Reed/Mikulski Amendment No. 4549 (to Amendment No. 4229) (listed above), and McCain Amendment No. 4229 (listed above), ripen at 11:15 a.m., on Thursday, June 9, 2016. **Page S3665**

House Messages:

Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act: Senate disagreed to the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 2577, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, agreed to the request from the House for a conference, and authorized the Presiding Officer to appoint conferees, after taking action on the following motions to instruct conferees on the part of the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill to be instructed to insist on the inclusion in the final conference report the following motions proposed thereto: **Page S3633**

Rejected:

By 46 yeas to 49 nays (Vote No. 93), Nelson Motion to Instruct Conferees to insist that any conference report shall not include proposals that would rescind existing Ebola emergency funds provided by the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2015 (Public Law 113–235), and designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as such funds support Ebola preparedness and response efforts which are critical to preventing, detecting, and responding to potential future Ebola outbreaks, and to insist that the final conference report include $510,000,000 to reimburse Ebola accounts, as provided for in the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2015 (Public Law 113–235) and designated by Congress as an

emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, for obligations incurred for Zika virus response, as such emergency Ebola funds support critical initiatives to prevent Ebola outbreaks, such as country operations and public health infrastructure in Liberia, Sierra Leone, and Guinea, public health research on infection control, including detection of person to person transmission of Ebola, and advanced research and development of new Ebola vaccines and therapeutics. (A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that the motion to instruct, having failed to achieve 60 affirmative votes, was not agreed to.) **Pages S3633–34**

By 56 yeas to 38 nays (Vote No. 94), Sullivan Motion to Instruct Conferees to insist that any conference report shall include the provisions contained in Senate amendment 4065 (relating to the reconstruction of certain bridges). (A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that the motion to instruct, having failed to achieve 60 affirmative votes, was not agreed to.) **Pages S3634–35**

During consideration of this measure today, Senate also took the following action:

By 93 yeas to 2 nays (Vote No. 92), three-fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn, having voted in the affirmative, Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on the motion to disagree to the House amendment to the Senate amendment, agree to the request from the House for a conference, and authorize the Presiding Officer to appoint conferees. **Page S3633**

The Chair was authorized to appoint the following conferees on the part of the Senate: Senators Collins, Kirk, McConnell, Murkowski, Hoeven, Boozman, Capito, Cochran, Blunt, Graham, Tester, Murray, Reed, Udall, Schatz, Baldwin, Murphy, Mikulski, and Leahy. **Page S3635**

Messages from the House: **Page S3642**

Measures Referred: **Pages S3642–43**

Executive Communications: **Page S3643**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S3646–49**

Additional Statements: **Pages S3640–42**

Amendments Submitted: **Pages S3649–64**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Pages S3664–65**

Privileges of the Floor: **Page S3665**

Record Votes: Three record votes were taken today. (Total—94) **Pages S3633–35**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 9:30 a.m. and adjourned at 9:09 p.m., until 9:30 a.m. on Thursday, June 9, 2016. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on page S3665.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

FAST ACT

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Committee concluded a hearing to examine implementation of the FAST Act, after receiving testimony from Anthony R. Foxx, Secretary of Transportation.

SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA

Committee on Foreign Relations: Subcommittee on Africa and Global Health Policy concluded a hearing to examine United States sanctions policy in Sub-Saharan Africa, after receiving testimony from Sue E. Eckert, Brown University Watson Institute for International and Public Affairs, Providence, Rhode Island; and Todd J. Moss, Center for Global Development, Princeton N. Lyman, United States Institute of Peace, and Brad Brooks-Rubin, Enough Project, all of Washington, D.C.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Geeta Pasi, of New York, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Chad, Anne S. Casper, of Nevada, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Burundi, and Mary Beth Leonard, of Massachusetts, to be Representative of the United States of America to the African Union, with the rank and status of Ambassador, all of the Department of State, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Indian Affairs: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

S. 2417, to amend the Indian Health Care Improvement Act to allow the Indian Health Service to cover the cost of a copayment of an Indian or Alaska

Native veteran receiving medical care or services from the Department of Veterans Affairs; and

S. 2916, to provide that the pueblo of Santa Clara may lease for 99 years certain restricted land.

INTERAGENCY FOREST MANAGEMENT

Committee on Indian Affairs: Committee concluded an oversight hearing to examine improving interagency forest management to strengthen tribal capabilities for responding to and preventing wildfires, including S. 3014, to improve the management of Indian forest land, after receiving testimony from Mike Black, Director, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior; James Hubbard, Deputy Chief, State and Private Forestry, Forest Service, Department of Agriculture; William Nicholson, Intertribal Timber Council, Coulee Dam, Washington; and Carole Lankford, Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation, Pablo, Montana.

H–2B TEMPORARY FOREIGN WORKER PROGRAM

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Immigration and the National Interest concluded a hearing to examine the H–2B Temporary Foreign Worker Program, focusing on examining the effects on Americans' job opportunities and wages, after receiving testimony from Michael Cunningham, Texas State Building and Construction Trades Council, Austin; Meredith B. Stewart, Southern Poverty Law Center, Montgomery, Alabama; and Daniel Costa, Economic Policy Institute, Stephen G. Bronars, Edgeworth Economics, and Steven A. Camarota, Center for Immigration Studies, all of Washington, D.C.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

S. 2992, to amend the Small Business Act to strengthen the Office of Credit Risk Management of the Small Business Administration, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 3009, to support entrepreneurs serving in the National Guard and Reserve, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute; and

S. 3024, to improve cyber security for small businesses.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 12 public bills, H.R. 5403–5414; and 2 resolutions, H. Res. 769, 772, were introduced. **Page H3563**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H3564–65**

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

H.R. 3738, to amend the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act to improve the transparency, accountability, governance, and operations of the Office of Financial Research, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 114–608);

H.R. 4638, to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to allow for the creation of venture exchanges to promote liquidity of venture securities, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 114–609);

H. Res. 770, providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5278) to establish an Oversight Board to assist the Government of Puerto Rico, including instrumentalities, in managing its public finances, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 114–610); and

H. Res. 771, providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5325) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2017, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 114–611). **Page H3563**

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Bost to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H3505**

Guest Chaplain: The prayer was offered by the Guest Chaplain, Reverend Brian Britton, The Dwelling Place Churches, Williamsburg, Virginia. **Page H3505**

Journal: The House agreed to the Speaker's approval of the Journal by voice vote. **Pages H3505, H3517**

Recess: The House recessed at 10:06 a.m. for the purpose of receiving His Excellency Narendra Modi, Prime Minister of India. The House reconvened at 12:46 p.m., and agreed that the proceedings had during the Joint Meeting be printed in the Record. **Page H3506**

Joint Meeting To Receive His Excellency Narendra Modi, Prime Minister of India: The House and Senate met in a joint session to receive His Excellency Narendra Modi, Prime Minister of

India. He was escorted into the Chamber by a committee comprised of Representatives Scalise, McMorris Rodgers, Walden, Messer, Jenkins (KS), Royce, Holding, Poe (TX), Wilson (SC), Lummis, Pelosi, Hoyer, Becerra, Crowley, Bera, McDermott, Pallone, Gabbard, Lowey, Edwards, Van Hollen, and Eshoo; and Senators McConnell, Cornyn, Hatch, Blunt, Barrasso, Wicker, Corker, Portman, Durbin, Murray, Stabenow, Klobuchar, and Cardin. **Pages H3506–08**

Suspension—Proceedings Resumed: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measure which was debated on Tuesday, June 7th:

Mount Hood Cooper Spur Land Exchange Clarification Act: H.R. 3826, amended, to amend the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009 to modify provisions relating to certain land exchanges in the Mt. Hood Wilderness in the State of Oregon, by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 401 yeas to 2 nays, Roll No. 275. **Page H3517**

Ozone Standards Implementation Act of 2016: The House passed H.R. 4775, to facilitate efficient State implementation of ground-level ozone standards, by a yea-and-nay vote of 234 yeas to 177 nays, Roll No. 282. **Pages H3517–37**

Rejected the Rush motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Energy and Commerce with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with an amendment, by a recorded vote of 173 ayes to 239 noes, Roll No. 281. **Pages H3535–37**

Pursuant to the Rule, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Energy and Commerce now printed in the bill shall be considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule. **Page H3525**

Agreed to:

Gosar amendment (No. 4 printed in H. Rept. 114–607) that ensures that the study on Ozone formation contained in the bill analyzes the relative contribution from wildfires; and **Pages H3529–30**

Whitfield amendment (No. 1 printed in H. Rept. 114–607) that provides that no additional funds are authorized to be appropriated to carry out the requirements of this Act and the amendments made by this Act; such requirements shall be carried out using amounts otherwise authorized (by a recorded vote of 236 ayes to 170 noes, Roll No. 276). **Pages H3526–27, H3532**

Rejected:

Rush amendment (No. 2 printed in H. Rept. 114–607) that sought to provide federal, state, local, or tribal permitting agencies the ability to opt-out of section 3(d) if they determine that issuing a preconstruction permit under an outdated and less protective air quality standard will increase air pollution, slow permitting, increase regulatory uncertainty, foster litigation, shift the burden of pollution control from new sources to existing sources, or increase the overall cost of achieving the new or revised national ambient air quality standard in the applicable area (by a recorded vote of 171 ayes to 235 noes, Roll No. 277); **Pages H3527–28, H3532–34**

Pallone amendment (No. 3 printed in H. Rept. 114–607) that sought to strike the consideration of technological feasibility when determining national ambient air quality standards to preserve health based standards (by a recorded vote of 169 ayes to 242 noes, Roll No. 278); **Pages H3528–29, H3533–34**

Polis amendment (No. 5 printed in H. Rept. 114–607) that sought to amend the Clean Air Act to repeal the prohibitions against aggregating emissions from any oil or gas exploration or production well and emissions; additionally, it requires the EPA to issue a rule adding hydrogen sulfide to the list of hazardous air pollutants (by a recorded vote of 160 ayes to 251 noes, Roll No. 279); and **Pages H3530–31, H3534**

Norton amendment (No. 6 printed in H. Rept. 114–607) that sought to provide that the provisions of the bill would not apply if the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Administration, in consultation with the Clean Air Scientific Advisory Committee, finds that the application of any section could harm human health or the environment (by a recorded vote of 171 ayes to 239 noes, Roll No. 280). **Pages H3531–32, H334–35**

H. Res. 767, the rule providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4775) and the concurrent resolutions (H. Con. Res. 89) and (H. Con. Res. 112) was agreed to by a recorded vote of 235 ayes to 163 noes, Roll No. 274, after the previous question was ordered by a yea-and-nay vote of 230 yeas to 163 nays, Roll No. 273. **Pages H3509–17**

Consideration of Presidential Veto Message: Agreed by unanimous consent that when a veto message on House Joint Resolution 88 is laid before the House on this legislative day, then after the message is read and the objections of the President are spread at large upon the Journal, further consideration of the veto message and the joint resolution shall be postponed until the legislative day of June 22, 2016, and that on that legislative day, the House shall proceed to the constitutional question of reconsideration and dispose of such question without intervening motion. **Page H3537**

Suspensions: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measure:

Securing America's Future Energy: Protecting our Infrastructure of Pipelines and Enhancing Safety Act: S. 2276, amended, to amend title 49,

United States Code, to provide enhanced safety in pipeline transportation. **Pages H3538–49**

Recess: The House recessed at 7:46 p.m. and reconvened at 10:03 p.m. **Page H3562**

Presidential Veto Message—Disapproving the rule submitted by the Department of Labor relating to the definition of the term "Fiduciary": Read a message from the President wherein he transmitted his Memorandum of Disapproval of H.J. Res. 88, disapproving the rule submitted by the Department of Labor relating to the definition of the term "Fiduciary", and explained his reasons therefore—ordered printed (H. Doc. 114–140). **Pages H3537–38**

Pursuant to the order of the House of today, further consideration of the veto message and the joint resolution are postponed until the legislative day of June 22, 2016, and that on that legislative day, the House shall proceed to the constitutional question of reconsideration and dispose of such question without intervening motion. **Page H3538**

Senate Message: Message received from the Senate by the Clerk and subsequently presented to the House today appears on page H3505.

Senate Referral: S. 2487 was held at the desk.

Quorum Calls—Votes: Three yea-and-nay votes and seven recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H3515–16, H3516, H3517, H3532, H3532–33, H3533–34, H3534, H3534–35, H3536–37, and H3537. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 10:04 p.m.

Committee Meetings

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Health concluded a markup on H.R. 3299, the "Strengthening Public Health Emergency Response Act of 2015"; and H.R. 921, the "Sports Medicine Licensure Clarity Act of 2015". H.R. 3299 and H.R. 921 were forwarded to the full committee, as amended.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Commerce, Manufacturing, and Trade began a markup on the "FTC Process and Transparency Reform Act of 2016"; H.R. 5111, the "Consumer Review Fairness Act"; H.R. 5092, the "Reinforcing American Made Products Act"; and H.R. 5104, the "Better Online Ticket Sales Act".

THE ENEMY IN OUR BACKYARD: EXAMINING TERROR FUNDING STREAMS FROM SOUTH AMERICA

Committee on Financial Services: Task Force to Investigate Terrorism Financing held a hearing entitled "The Enemy in Our Backyard: Examining Terror Funding Streams from South America". Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Homeland Security: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 5064, the "Improving Small Business Cyber Security Act of 2016"; H.R. 5253, the "Strong Visa Integrity Secures America Act"; H.R. 5390, the "Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Protection Agency Act of 2016"; H.R. 5388, the "Support for Rapid Innovation Act of 2016"; H.R. 5389, the "Leveraging Emerging Technologies Act of 2016"; H.R. 5391, the "Gains in Global Nuclear Detection Architecture Act"; and H.R. 5385, the "Quadrennial Homeland Security Review Technical Correction Act of 2016". The following bills were ordered reported, as amended: H.R. 5064, H.R. 5253, H.R. 5385, and H.R. 5390. The following bills were ordered reported, without amendment: H.R. 5388, H.R. 5389, and H.R. 5391.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on the Judiciary: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 4768, the "Separation of Powers Restoration Act of 2016". H.R. 4768 was ordered reported, as amended.

PUERTO RICO OVERSIGHT, MANAGEMENT, AND ECONOMIC STABILITY ACT; LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2017

Committee on Rules: Full Committee held a hearing on H.R. 5278, the "Puerto Rico Oversight, Management, and Economic Stability Act"; and H.R. 5325, the "Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2017". The committee granted, by record vote of 9–2, a structured rule for H.R. 5325. The rule provides one hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill and provides that it shall be considered as read. The rule waives all points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI. The rule makes in order only those amendments printed in the Rules Committee report. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in

the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question. The rule waives all points of order against the amendments printed in the report. The rule provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions. In section 2, the rule provides that during consideration of H.R. 5325, section 3304 of Senate Concurrent Resolution 11 shall not apply. The Committee granted, by voice vote, a structured rule for H.R. 5278. The rule provides one hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill. The rule makes in order as original text for purpose of amendment an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 114–57 and provides that it shall be considered as read. The rule waives all points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute. The rule makes in order only those further amendments printed in the Rules Committee report. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question. The rule waives all points of order against the amendments printed in the report. The rule provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions. In section 2, the rule provides that upon passage of H.R. 5278, the House shall be considered to have: (1) stricken all after the enacting clause of S. 2328 and inserted in lieu thereof the provisions of H.R. 5278, as passed by the House; and (2) passed the Senate bill as so amended. Testimony was heard from Chairman Bishop of Utah, and Representatives Graves of Georgia, Wasserman Schultz, Jones, Castro of Texas, Massie, Welch, Grijalva, Graves of Louisiana, Bordallo, Sablan, Polis, Barr, Gutiérrez, Fleming, Palmer, and Sanford.

PRIVATE SECTOR WEATHER FORECASTING: ASSESSING PRODUCTS AND TECHNOLOGIES

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Subcommittee on Environment held a hearing entitled "Private Sector Weather Forecasting: Assessing Products and Technologies". Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

MEMBER PROPOSALS TO IMPROVE AND SUSTAIN THE MEDICARE PROGRAM

Committee on Ways and Means: Subcommittee on Health held a hearing on Member proposals to improve and sustain the Medicare program. Testimony was heard from Representatives Boustany, Dold, Noem, Reichert, Crowley, Larson of Connecticut, Meehan, Renacci, Mooney of West Virginia, Smith of New Jersey, and Zeldin.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THURSDAY, JUNE 9, 2016

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Appropriations: business meeting to markup an original bill entitled, "Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2017", 10:30 a.m., SD–106.

Committee on Environment and Public Works: to hold hearings to examine implications of the Supreme Court stay of the Clean Power Plan, 9:30 a.m., SD–406.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Subcommittee on Regulatory Affairs and Federal Management, to hold hearings to examine the use of agency regulatory guidance, 11:15 a.m., SD–342.

Committee on the Judiciary: business meeting to consider S. 247, to amend section 349 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to deem specified activities in support of terrorism as renunciation of United States nationality, S. 356, to improve the provisions relating to the privacy of electronic communications, S. 2944, to require adequate reporting on the Public Safety Officers' Benefit program, and the nominations of Donald Karl Schott, of Wisconsin, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Seventh Circuit, Stephanie A. Finley, of Louisiana, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Louisiana, Claude J. Kelly III, of Louisiana, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Louisiana, and Winfield D. Ong, of Indiana, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Indiana, 10 a.m., SD–226.

Committee on Rules and Administration: business meeting to consider the nomination of Carla D. Hayden, of Maryland, to be Librarian of Congress for a term of ten years, 2 p.m., SR–301.

Select Committee on Intelligence: closed business meeting to consider pending intelligence matters; to be immediately followed by a closed briefing on certain intelligence matters, 2 p.m., SH–219.

House

Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Homeland Security, markup on the Homeland Security Appropriations Bill, FY 2017, 9 a.m., 2358–A Rayburn.

Full Committee, markup on the Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Bill for FY 2017; and Report on the Revised Interim Suballocation of Budget Allocations for FY 2017, 10 a.m., 2359 Rayburn.

Committee on Armed Services, Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities; and Subcommittee on Terrorism, Nonproliferation, and Trade of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, joint hearing entitled ''Stopping the Money Flow: The War on Terror Finance'', 2 p.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Committee on the Budget, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''Congressional Budgeting: The Need To Control Automatic Spending and Unauthorized Programs'', 9:30 a.m., 210 Cannon.

Committee on Education and the Workforce, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''The Administration's Overtime Rule and Its Consequences for Workers, Students, Nonprofits, and Small Businesses'', 10 a.m., 2175 Rayburn.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, Subcommittee on Commerce, Manufacturing, and Trade, markup on the ''FTC Process and Transparency Reform Act of 2016''; H.R. 5111, the ''Consumer Review Fairness Act''; H.R. 5092, the ''Reinforcing American Made Products Act''; and H.R. 5104, the ''Better Online Ticket Sales Act'' (continued), 10 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere, hearing entitled ''The Impact of Low Oil Prices on Energy Security in the Americas'', 10:30 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Europe, Eurasia, and Emerging Threats, hearing entitled ''Examining the President's FY 2017 Budget Proposal Europe and Eurasia'', 2 p.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations, hearing entitled ''Leveraging U.S. Funds: The Stunning Global Impact of Nutrition and Supplements During the First 1,000 Days'', 2 p.m., 2255 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific, hearing entitled ''Sri Lanka's Democratic Transition: A New Era for the U.S.-Sri Lanka Relationship'', 2 p.m., 2200 Rayburn.

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''Census 2020: Examining the Readiness of Key Aspects of the Census Bureau's 2020 Census Preparation'', 9 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Government Operations; and Subcommittee on the Interior, joint hearing entitled ''SNAP: Examining Efforts to Combat Fraud and Improve Program Integrity'', 2 p.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Committee on Small Business, Subcommittee on Economic Growth, Tax and Capital Access, hearing entitled ''Bearing the Burden: Over-regulation's Impact on Small Banks and Rural Communities'', 10 a.m., 2360 Rayburn.

Next Meeting of the **SENATE**

9:30 a.m., Thursday, June 9

Senate Chamber

Program for Thursday: Senate will continue consideration of S. 2943, National Defense Authorization Act, with votes on the motions to invoke cloture on Reed/Mikulski Amendment No. 4549 (to Amendment No. 4229), and McCain Amendment No. 4229, at 11:15 a.m.

Next Meeting of the **HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

10 a.m., Thursday, June 9

House Chamber

Program for Thursday: Consideration of H.R. 5278—Puerto Rico Oversight, Management, and Economic Stability Act (Subject to a Rule). Begin consideration of H.R. 5325—Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2017 (Subject to a Rule).

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Congressional Record The *Congressional Record* (USPS 087–390). The Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, D.C. The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Publishing Office, at *www.fdsys.gov*, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Publishing Office. Phone 202–512–1800, or 866–512–1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, *contactcenter@gpo.gov*. ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197–9000, or phone orders to 866–512–1800 (toll-free), 202–512–1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202–512–2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.
POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Publishing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.