



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 162

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 21, 2016

No. 143

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
September 21, 2016.

I hereby appoint the Honorable REID J. RIBBLE to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 5, 2016, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

MASS IMMIGRATION AND FUTURE PROSPERITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BROOKS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, if not for the massive immigration wave of the last 40 years, America's population would have stabilized or had very modest growth. Instead, America's population has exploded to 321 million people, due primarily to 62 million foreign-born people, plus their minor children.

As an aside, illegal aliens are estimated to account for roughly 25 per-

cent of that growth. Overall, America's foreign-born population grew from 4.7 percent of total population in 1970 to over 13 percent of population in 2015.

Consistent with the above, the Census Bureau estimates that, within 7 years, America's population will have the highest percentage of foreign-born people since the Revolutionary War, adding another 74 million people to America's population over the next 45 years.

Although Americans are supportive or tolerant of legal immigration, they are showing a growing unease in the face of this record-breaking immigration tidal wave that drives up welfare costs, overcrowds schools and hospitals, and increasingly subjects American citizens to growing crime and terrorist attack risks.

Consistent with this growing concern, a recent poll found that 61 percent of Americans believe "continued immigration into the country jeopardizes the United States." Notwithstanding America's concern, America's wealthy elite use their campaign contributions, political influence, and popular media to glorify legal and illegal immigration to ensure their continuance.

Puppet-like politicians expand visa programs, ignore laws that protect Americans from illegal aliens, and seek to legalize those illegal aliens who have broken into our homes. Left-wing media, Democrats, and even some Republicans brand as racist and small-minded the working-class Americans who object to massive immigration and label concerned politicians as paranoid isolationists.

What drives the craving by America's wealthy elite for more foreign workers?

Follow the money. Throughout history, from lords to merchant princes, elite have acquired great wealth by exploiting cheap slave or low-cost foreign labor.

Even here, America's two great immigration waves depressed incomes of

working citizens as large numbers of immigrants blew up the labor supply while also competing for and taking jobs from American citizens.

On the plus side, back when America had seemingly unlimited natural resources and great spaces of open land, immigrants were self-sufficient, were not a financial burden on other Americans, and grew America's wealth and gross domestic product.

In Ecclesiastes in the Bible, a very wise man, Solomon, once said: "To everything there is a season, and a time to every purpose under the Heaven."

Times have changed. America's natural resources are limited. We must import metals and energy to sustain our economy. Great spaces of usable land are long gone. Further, technological advances in the intelligent machine age are dramatically changing labor markets. Rather than just more productive tools that must still have a human in the operational loop, intelligent machines produce value independently with minimal to no labor requirements. No longer is massive population growth essential to grow America's gross domestic product.

America must recognize our challenges and opportunities. While over 5 billion foreigners want to migrate to America, in part, because they earn only \$10 a day in their own countries, America has enough citizens and technology to assure our common defense and economic advancement.

Each foreigner imported consumes space and resources, neither of which is infinite. Hence, we must be more selective in our immigration policies to ensure incoming immigrants are both self-sufficient and able and willing to be properly absorbed into American society. If we aren't, America's population will explode and America will lose its special place in history.

This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H5715

FREE OSCAR LOPEZ RIVERA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIÉRREZ) for 5 minutes.

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, this past weekend, I visited four cities in four States to meet with Puerto Rican elected officials, leaders, and members of the Puerto Rican diaspora about a very important campaign.

I was in Hartford, Connecticut; Springfield and Holyoke, Massachusetts; New York, New York; and Newark, New Jersey, for activities, parades, and discussions that were very successful. This week, I will be back in Chicago with my fellow Puerto Ricans at the National Museum of Puerto Rican Arts and Culture to honor the organization and to recognize the talent and cultural contributions of Antonio Martorell and Lin-Manuel Miranda, who make us all proud.

But I am not traveling on a campaign for President or for a political candidate. Rather, I am meeting with people all over about a campaign for the current President to take action before he leaves office in January to free Oscar Lopez Rivera, the last political prisoner from Puerto Rico, who has been held for 35 years in an American prison.

No one disputes that the President of the United States has the power to grant pardons, commute sentences, and grant clemency. It is a power the President alone possesses as our chief executive. Congress and the courts can do nothing to override him in this case.

Puerto Ricans and allies all over the world are asking the President to grant clemency to Oscar Lopez Rivera. He was not convicted of committing a violent crime. Rather, he was convicted of seditious conspiracy, espousing the belief that the people of Puerto Rico are capable of, entitled to, and have the right to self-determination and freedom.

This man, Oscar Lopez Rivera, who is now in his seventies and has spent half of his life in prison, is no threat to the United States or Puerto Rico. He harbors no nefarious plot to harm anyone. He is simply a man who served an inordinate sentence for the crime for which he was convicted. And now Puerto Ricans want their elder statesman to live out his days in Puerto Rico. In fact, Mr. Speaker, there are few issues that unite the Puerto Rican people more than the united front that is assembling to call for the release of Oscar Lopez Rivera.

Hundreds have already pledged to join us on October 9 in Lafayette Park in Washington, D.C., to make our unity and our commitment known. I know from my own experience that all too often Puerto Ricans are divided from each other along so many lines of politics, class, and geography. But in this case, in this cause, in the united call, Puerto Ricans are united as never before.

The House and the Senate of the island's legislature, all the candidates

for Governor and major office, current and past elected officials, city councils and municipal governments across the island, from San Juan to the smallest villages, support the release of Oscar Lopez Rivera—across party lines, across lines that often separate statehood advocates and independence and commonwealth advocates. Practically every bishop, every denomination, every congregation, parish, and church—almost the entire faith community on the island—has called for Oscar's release.

It is not just a Puerto Rican thing, Mr. Speaker. It is a movement that has sparked followers across the United States as well. The AFL-CIO, AFSCME, SEIU, Communications Workers of America, and other allies in the labor movement are standing up for justice and standing up for the release of Oscar Lopez Rivera.

The ACLU, the Hispanic National Bar Association, and religious leaders of all stripes are onboard. The City Council of New York City and the Newark, New Jersey Municipal Council passed resolutions. My friends and colleagues on the Congressional Hispanic Caucus here in Congress have joined us in the call for Oscar Lopez Rivera to be released. I thank the members of the Hispanic Caucus.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, Oscar Lopez Rivera's case and the call for him to be released has received international attention and validation. Presidents, Nobel laureates, leaders, artists, activists, and the world over, know it is time to let Oscar return in peace to his island.

Archbishop Desmond Tutu, the Archbishop Emeritus of the Anglican Church in Cape Town, a true champion of justice across the globe, has expressed his unwavering support for the release of this prisoner.

Mr. Speaker, based on the merits of this case, the outpouring of support, and the moral obligation and power that has been placed in his hands, I join freedom fighters, justice lovers, Puerto Ricans, and individuals across the globe in asking President Obama to use his pen to free Oscar Lopez Rivera.

Please join us in Washington, D.C., on October 9 in Lafayette Park and let your voice be heard.

COMMEMORATING THE NICKLAUS CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL SCHOOL LIAISON PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the efforts of my former staff member, Janelle Perez, and her partner, Monica Ruiz, in helping the School Liaison Program for Nicklaus Children's Hospital, located in my congressional district.

Having both been affected by cancer in different life-altering ways, Janelle and Monica collaborated with the

Miami Children's Health Foundation on methods that could have the largest and most profound impact on the lives of so many children who are undergoing treatment at the Nicklaus Children's Hospital.

Through Janelle and Monica's passion for children and education, the School Liaison Program was born. The program is designed to provide guidance and advocacy to patients and their families in order to continue academic growth while undergoing clinical treatment.

The program aids in recovery by bringing a sense of normalcy and confidence to these children, instilling in them the hope that they will recover and soon return to the normal day-to-day activities they enjoyed before becoming ill.

Congratulations to Janelle and Monica for helping sick children through the Nicklaus Children's Hospital School Liaison Program.

COMMEMORATING THE MIAMI CHILDRENS THEATER ON ITS 20TH ANNIVERSARY

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Miami Children's Theater on its 20th anniversary as an invaluable education center for children and young adults in our south Florida community. I would like to recognize its outstanding leadership team, including their executive producing director and founder, Angela Ardolino.

Originally an after-school program at the Coral Gables Youth Center, located in my congressional district, it was Angela's efforts and strategic vision that transformed this prominent center into what it is today.

Miami Children's Theater was the first children's theater in the Nation to be granted rights to the student edition of *Les Misérables*.

More importantly, children and young adults from all over the community are given the opportunity to explore the arts and expand on their creativity both on stage and in classes.

It is my honor and privilege to recognize the Miami Children's Theater and wish all of the members the best as they work toward the next 20 years of service to our south Florida community.

HONORING THE EPILEPSY FOUNDATION OF FLORIDA

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the Epilepsy Foundation of Florida as it celebrates its 45th anniversary.

From support groups to case management and medical services, the Epilepsy Foundation offers diverse programs and resources and serves as a pillar of support to the over 400,000 Floridians living with this condition.

Mr. Speaker, this neurological disorder is in need of greater public attention. According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, people with epilepsy experience health and social disparities, such as a worse health-related quality of life and low socioeconomic status.

Organizations like the Epilepsy Foundation of Florida are stepping up to the challenge and informing communities in Florida and across our Nation about these issues, advocating for better public policies and working every day to improve the lives of individuals afflicted with this difficult disease through research and education. Epilepsy can affect anyone, children and adults alike, and it is crucial to inform communities on how to respond in an emergency.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my south Florida community to join and celebrate this wonderful organization at the annual Unmasking Epilepsy Masquerade on October 13 in the Coral Gables Museum, located in my congressional district.

Thank you to the Epilepsy Foundation of Florida for all that it continues to do.

□ 1015

Mr. Speaker, I would like to honor Susan Dean, who will be retiring from this esteemed institution at the end of October, after 19 years of invaluable service to so many women Members who have made their marks in the Halls of Congress.

Susan has been in charge of the magnificent Lindy Claiborne Boggs Congressional Women's Reading Room with professionalism, efficiency, and care, while keeping the historical room so immaculately preserved.

From changes in leadership, to the enactment of landmark legislation, to the inauguration of the Capitol Visitor Center, to the unveiling of a myriad of statues and portraits and innumerable nights where votes have run past midnight, much has transpired during Susan's tenure in the House.

Since I met Susan in 1997, I have heard her recount the magnificence of the Lindy Boggs suite, and it truly never ceases to amaze me. Susan has provided a great service to our constituents by graciously offering them a personalized tour of this hidden gem.

The people's House will suffer a great loss with Susan's departure, and she will be deeply missed by her many friends here in this Chamber.

Please join me in wishing Susan Dean all the best as she enjoys her first few months of retirement traveling across our country visiting family and friends.

Godspeed, Susan Dean, mi amiga.

REPUBLICAN CRUSADE AGAINST THE IRS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, currently, in the House Judiciary Committee, there is an unusual spectacle unfolding. Now, a number of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have made it a crusade to war against the IRS. They have cut staff, budgets,

refused to help it collect money that is due and owed. They have made it easier for cheats to avoid their obligations. But this assault on the IRS Commissioner takes that war to a new low.

I would invite anybody listening to this presentation right now to go to the internal channel in the House, number 42, or go to cspan.org to be able to watch it yourself. Walk down to Room 2237 Rayburn and watch this play out.

I have had a chance to get to know John Koskinen, the IRS Commissioner, over the course of this last year, and I have come to respect and admire him. I would suggest to anybody trying to put this in context, trying to understand the give-and-take, google Mr. Koskinen, and then google some of his fiercest critics who are going to be on display at the Judiciary Committee today.

Which of his critics would you imagine to be entrusted with being the chair of the board of trustees for their prestigious university, should they have attended one? Mr. Koskinen was.

Which of them would have been successful in business as a turnaround artist in some of the most difficult and challenging commercial transactions? Mr. Koskinen was. And then walk away from material and business success to volunteer for some of the most challenging jobs in Government? Mr. Koskinen did.

Which of these members of the Judiciary Committee that are attacking Mr. Koskinen would have been picked by a President of their own party to take some of the most challenging and difficult and important tasks? Mr. Koskinen was. The Y2K czar, when we were concerned about what would happen in the year 2000 and the integrity of computer systems; Mr. Koskinen was administrator for the District of Columbia when that city was turned around.

Which of them would have been asked by a President of the other party to step in and handle a major systemic challenge? The IRS Commissioner, a Democrat, was asked by the Bush administration to step in and right the ship of Freddie Mac during the near meltdown of the global economy.

And he came back, volunteering for one of the most difficult tasks in government, to deal with an IRS that has been underfunded, understaffed, while Congress makes its job almost impossible by making the Tax Code more complex each and every year. John Koskinen did.

Google the people who are attacking him and see if any of them have accomplishments that are remotely equal to what this distinguished American did and has done and continues to do.

This is a shameful display. This gentleman is being attacked for things that predated his tenure, not high crimes and misdemeanors and corruption, but because they don't like what went on there, and they are trying to find somebody to blame other than themselves.

Look at what is going on in the Judiciary Committee. Google these people; evaluate for yourselves.

The American people deserve better than what is going on now, and certainly, Mr. Koskinen does.

CONGRATULATING CLEARWATER POLICE OFFICER JONATHAN WALSER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. JOLLY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a man who has served our country and his community as a U.S. Marine, a sheriff's deputy, and as a police detective.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate my very dear friend and American patriot, a man of deep and abiding Christian faith, Mr. Jonathan Walser, on his retirement from the Clearwater Florida Police Department.

After serving his country in the United States Marine Corps for 6 years, Officer Walser opted to continue serving his community by joining the Pasco County Sheriff's Department in 1994 as a detention deputy. Two years later, Walser joined the Clearwater Police Department and began a career that has made an incredible impact on our entire Clearwater community.

Early on, Officer Walser demonstrated remarkable commitment and leadership, earning a highly successful rating at the conclusion of his new-hire probationary period.

Officer Walser would serve in several specialty assignments during his career. He served as a field training officer and a member of the emergency response team.

He also served for more than a decade on the Clearwater Police Department honor guard team. As an honor guard member, Officer Walser has represented the department at hundreds of funerals and memorial services and, in particular, has honored the families of fallen officers, a duty most personal to him.

Officer Walser served as a community police officer on Clearwater's Wood Valley Community policing team in 2001 and 2002.

In June 2002, Officer Walser was assigned to serve on the traffic enforcement team motorcycle unit, a role in which he focused on traffic safety, intoxicated driving, and crash investigations. Jonathan most compassionately used his department motorcycle as a tool to connect with the community, frequently posing for photos with kids sitting on the motorcycle.

In August 2011, Officer Walser transferred to the criminal investigations division burglary unit to serve as a detective. During his time as a detective, he was continually lauded for his superior investigative abilities and report-writing skills, in addition to his passion for being actively engaged in the community and volunteering at local events.

In 2015, Officer Walser returned to the traffic enforcement team motorcycle unit, where he served until his recent retirement.

Officer Walser also serves as an active board member with the Fraternal Order of Police Lodge 10. He has served as the president of Lodge 10 for an incredible 12 years, and has been selected 11 times as the FOP Lodge 10 Member of the Year.

Officer Walser is not only highly respected by FOP members, but also by his fellow Clearwater Police Department colleagues, City of Clearwater leadership, and a broad base of community leaders. Because of his exceptional service, Officer Walser has received the Chief's Unit Citation for his service with the honor guard team and the burglary unit.

When asked about Officer Walser, Clearwater Police Chief Dan Slaughter said:

Officer Walser proves that you don't need to be a supervisor to be a remarkable leader. I have never met a person more dedicated to the officers, their families, and the entire community.

I couldn't agree more with Chief Slaughter.

Mr. Speaker, John Walser is a dear friend of mine. He is a dear friend of so many in the Clearwater community, a constant source of faith-based counsel, a compassionate leader, a man who deeply loves his family, deeply loves his community, and deeply loves the God in whom he daily puts his trust.

I ask my colleagues to join me in thanking a remarkable person, Officer Jonathan Walser, for his years of service to our country and to our community in Florida. We wish him the very best in his retirement.

HISPANIC HERITAGE MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA) for 5 minutes.

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, as a proud member of the Hispanic Caucus, I rise today to celebrate Hispanic Heritage Month, the rich history, the culture, and the traditions of the Latino communities throughout our Nation and the world.

The United States of America is a nation of immigrants past and present, and the stories of the Latino communities who live in California's San Joaquin Valley are similar to the millions of stories of other immigrant families who have come to our country striving for the American Dream. They have come to our country from around the world.

Working together, we can ensure that policies that benefit our economy and keep families together, like the expanded DACA, the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals, and DAPA, the Deferred Action for Parents of Americans, as well as comprehensive immigration reform, are enacted. This is important to fix a broken immigration system in America today.

These policies would move our country forward and provide a path to earned citizenship—not amnesty, but earned citizenship—so that individuals who only know the United States as their home can achieve the American Dream, the American Dream which is still a shining light around the world for people that are oppressed. Let us never forget what the American Dream embodies not just in our country, but for people around the world.

Please join me in celebrating Hispanic Heritage Month and the values, the dedications, and the rich diversity of immigrant families, of which my family was one and the majority of families in our country at some time or another were the proud immigrants from some other part of the world, that make this United States the greatest country in the world today.

25TH ANNIVERSARY OF ARMENIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I also rise today to join in celebrating the 25th anniversary of Armenia. Twenty-five years ago today, Armenia declared its independence from the Soviet Union and, once again, the Republic of Armenia was established.

Earlier this year, I had the opportunity to visit Armenia for the first time, and it truly felt like coming home. Why? Well, because it felt so much like the San Joaquin Valley that I proudly represent, where so many Armenians have settled for generations since their diaspora and as a result of the Armenian genocide.

Like so many other ethnic groups throughout the world, the people of Armenia are friendly. They are warm and proud of their traditions, culture, and religion.

I had the opportunity as a young person to grow up with so many of our good friends and neighbors—the Kezerians, the Abrahamians, the Koligians—whose Armenian heritage I learned as a young person and has added so much not only to the community of the San Joaquin Valley, but to our Nation as a whole.

It is an honor to recognize Armenia's 25th anniversary and the Armenian people in the San Joaquin Valley and the communities throughout the Nation and the world.

But, Mr. Speaker, I think I would be remiss in this recognition if I did not take this opportunity to urge Congress and the President of the United States to go on record as recognizing the Armenian genocide and the devastating violence committed against the Armenian people over 100 years ago, the first genocide recorded and recognized by historians in the 20th century.

□ 1030

Of course, we know from that genocide came the later followed by the Holocaust, and sadly generations have suffered. I want to thank my colleagues for joining in recognizing Armenia's 25th anniversary.

BALANCING THE BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOONEY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate my friend, Delegate John Overington, and the West Virginia State Legislature for passing the balanced budget amendment resolution in March.

West Virginia has joined 27 other States in calling for a constitutional convention under Article V to force the Federal Government to add a balanced budget amendment to the U.S. Constitution for one simple reason: the Federal Government has a spending problem. America has run up a debt of over \$19 trillion, largely to fund past and present expenditures using money that should belong to future American generations.

West Virginia families and businesses have to operate on balanced budgets, and I believe the Federal Government should also have to operate within its means. America cannot afford to continue spending like it has been. That is why I cosponsored H.J. Res. 2, the balanced budget amendment to the Constitution. I encourage my colleagues in the House and Senate to cosponsor this important joint resolution.

HAPPY BIRTHDAY TO CORPORAL HERSHEL "WOODY" WILLIAMS

Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to say happy birthday to a true American hero, Corporal Hershel "Woody" Williams.

Woody is one of the last two surviving United States Marine Corps Medal of Honor recipients of World War II and the last surviving Medal of Honor recipient from the Battle of Iwo Jima.

Born on October 2, 1923, Woody Williams grew up on a dairy farm in Fairmont, West Virginia. He enlisted in the United States Marine Corps Reserve in Charleston, West Virginia, on May 26, 1943.

Woody completed 2 years of service and was trained to use both tanks and flamethrowers. Williams, a corporal, landed in Iwo Jima in 1945. American tanks were trying to open a lane for the infantry when they encountered a network of reinforced Japanese concrete pillboxes, buried mines, and black volcanic sands.

Corporal Williams went forward with his 70-pound flamethrower in an attempt to reduce the devastating machine gun fire from the fortified enemy positions. Covered by only four riflemen, he continued this arduous task for 4 hours under heavy enemy small-arms fire.

He resupplied and returned to the front lines time and again to wipe out one enemy pillbox after another. On one of these returns, to the point of the spear of the battle, a wisp of smoke alerted him to an air vent of a Japanese bunker. He approached this heavily fortified position close enough to put the nozzle of his flamethrower

through the vent, killing all the occupants inside.

On another occasion, he was charged by multiple enemy riflemen who attempted to kill him with fixed bayonets. Woody was too quick, and he used his flamethrower to send them to their makers. These actions occurred on the same day as the raising of the U.S. flag on the island's Mount Suribachi. Woody fought through the remainder of the 5-week long battle and was wounded on March 6, for which he was awarded the Purple Heart.

President Truman awarded him the Medal of Honor in 1945. In 2013, the Hershel "Woody" Williams Medal of Honor Foundation was launched to carry out Woody's vision of recognizing and honoring Gold Star families around the country. The goal of the foundation is to establish at least one Gold Star family memorial monument in every State over the next 5 years to honor families who have sacrificed a loved one in service of their country.

Woody spends his time traveling the country supporting the military families and reminding all of us that freedom has not been and is not free.

Upcoming memorial dedications are in Fort Knox, Kentucky, on September 23; Fall River, Massachusetts, and Port St. Lucie, Florida, on September 25; Palmetto Bay, Florida, on October 15; Barboursville, West Virginia, on October 30; Annapolis, Maryland, on November 11; and Medina, Ohio, on November 12.

Woody's passion and love of his country and fellow man has never ceased. We can all learn how to be better Americans from Woody, and I wish him a happy upcoming 93rd birthday.

DAKOTA ACCESS PIPELINE ADVOCACY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. RUIZ) for 5 minutes.

Mr. RUIZ. Mr. Speaker, the Standing Rock Sioux and all tribes have the right to self-determination and a say in decisions that impact their health, land, and cultural preservation. It is not just a matter of justice, it is the law. Don't we all, as Americans, have that right? Isn't that the whole premise of our democracy?

Being able to have a voice in decisions that affect our lives is the cornerstone of our American democracy. It thrives when we stand up, speak up, and voice our concerns on matters vital to our existence as humans, like our health, clean drinking water, and cultural survival.

That is why I stand with the Standing Rock Sioux and hundreds of tribes throughout our Nation to demand that the Army Corps of Engineers comply with their legal trust responsibilities to protect tribal lands, cancel the Dakota Access Pipeline permit, conduct meaningful consultation with the tribes, and do a complete environmental impact statement.

The Standing Rock Sioux and neighboring tribes are rightfully concerned that the pipeline will destroy sacred sites and that an oil spill would cause devastating and irreversible harm to their land, health, and drinking water. The proposed pipeline is over 1,000 miles long, transporting up to 16,000 gallons of crude oil a minute, upstream from the tribes' water source, near the reservation, and on tribal land. A leak would be devastating. It was already determined to be too risky to construct near the city of Bismarck's water sources.

The Army Corps has granted construction permits, despite legal and noncompliance warnings by other Federal agencies. That is why, on September 8, I called for a systemwide GAO investigative report on Federal agencies' compliance with meaningful tribal consultation policies. On September 9, the Departments of the Interior, Justice, and the Army announced a pause in construction to review their compliance with Federal policies. I welcome this review.

Tribes have rights under law. The Federal Government has a moral and legally enforceable obligation to protect tribal treaties, land, and resources under the Federal trust responsibility. Tribes have the right to regular and meaningful consultation under executive order 13175. Under the Historic Preservation Act, Federal agencies are required to be responsible stewards of our Nation's historic resources and consult with Indian tribes when their actions may impact sacred sites.

Furthermore, the Army Corps, under the Clean Water Act, must protect our Nation's waters from contamination by conducting accurate environmental assessments to determine if construction permits should be granted. Unfortunately, the Army Corps granted a permit based on flawed assessments, incomplete information, and a willful disregard for the serious concerns raised by the tribe and other Federal agencies.

Chairman David Achambault from the Standing Rock Sioux reported that they were not meaningfully consulted and didn't even know about the Corps' assessment until it was made public. He has serious concerns about the pipeline's harm to the tribe's health, water source, and sacred sites.

Letters from the Department of the Interior, Environmental Protection Agency, and Advisory Council on Historic Preservation to the Army Corps list their serious concerns. They mention the potential of a devastating oil spill, lack of emergency response plans, desecration of sacred sites, noncompliance with Federal policies and laws, and even disagreed with the Corps' environmental assessment.

They recommended a full environmental impact study, an expanded environmental justice analysis, consideration of all sacred sites along the path of the pipeline, and meaningful tribal consultation prior to any decisions.

Moving forward, all Federal agencies must conduct meaningful tribal consultation and address concerns regarding risks to drinking water and desecration of sacred sites. The Corps must cancel their faulty permit near tribal land and complete a full environmental impact statement. Only then can the President make an informed decision to permanently stop construction of the pipeline on Federal property near tribal land. You have the authority and moral imperative to do what is right.

Time after time, tribes have seen their treaties broken, their lands taken, and sacred sites desecrated. I visited with the Standing Rock Sioux and witnessed Native Americans from hundreds of other tribes standing together in peace and prayer to protect their water and ancestral sacred sites. I have witnessed their dignity and their resolve. They stand in solidarity for their full rights under Federal law and for their voices to be heard. They stand in unity, and I stand with them.

WISHING HERSHEL "WOODY" WILLIAMS A HAPPY 93RD BIRTHDAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. JENKINS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, as the Congressman representing West Virginia's Third Congressional District, I am proud to call Hershel "Woody" Williams a constituent.

I first met Woody more than 18 years ago when I was first elected to the State legislature, and he has been a constituent of mine for the past two decades. But I am just as proud to call Woody my friend.

Over the years, at countless legislative committee hearings, veterans' recognition and appreciation events, Veterans Day, and Memorial Day commemorations, Woody has been there fighting for our veterans. Woody always has a kind word, a friendly smile, and an optimistic outlook.

I have two sons that became Eagle Scouts. Very often our local Scout council gets the newly awarded Eagles all together, and Woody is invited to come in and spend a little time with the boys and share a few thoughts. I can't tell you the power of the impact it had on my boys when Woody shook their hand, looked them in the eye, and challenged them to conduct their life according to the Scout oath and motto—to do their duty to God and country.

Woody truly embodies that motto. Throughout West Virginia and the Nation, Woody is best known for his brave efforts in the Pacific theater during World War II. At a critical point in the Battle of Iwo Jima, and with minimal backup, Corporal Williams heard the call and acted. He disregarded his personal safety. He thought not of the seemingly monumental task in front of him. He did not stop to calculate the odds of success—or the odds of failure.

He acted. He picked up his flame-thrower, and he ran towards those trying to take him out; and he did it again and again and again. He did so because he believed in something greater than himself, because his country asked him, and he answered. He was there in that place and at that time when his country—our country—needed him the most.

Woody is the last surviving Medal of Honor recipient from the Battle of Iwo Jima, and he is celebrating his 93rd birthday on October 2. I join my State and a grateful Nation in thanking Woody Williams for his service and in wishing him a wonderful birthday.

TRANS-PACIFIC PARTNERSHIP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) for 5 minutes.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring attention to another bad trade deal that could soon be forced upon us. It is possible that the Trans-Pacific Partnership, or TPP, could be brought before this body for a final vote before the end of the year and end of this Congress.

We have seen time and again what bad trade deals do to our communities and to working families across this Nation. You see, when NAFTA was under consideration, American workers were told that the trade benefits would mean more jobs and economic opportunities.

What actually happened? We saw a net loss of 700,000 jobs thanks to NAFTA. So if history is any guide, we know what to expect from TPP. But in many ways, this agreement is even more harmful than NAFTA. In fact, the core of this deal is allowing foreign corporations to sue the U.S. Government over regulations they simply do not like.

□ 1045

Imagine, any time there is an environmental regulation or worker safety regulation that a company does not care for, they can sue.

These cases will not go through the regular legal process. Instead, TPP creates a special tribunal of three corporate lawyers to evaluate the case. And if a company convinces these three lawyers that a law or regulation violates their TPP rights, well, then the American taxpayer has to pay these corporations enormous compensation.

Let's be clear. There is no appeal process. There is no way to reverse these decisions. The TPP could put the taxpayer on the hook for almost unlimited sums of money.

It is no wonder that this agreement was negotiated in private. While corporations were given plenty of opportunity to comment on how they wanted the agreement to look, the public and workers were not given a seat in the room—or even the chance to review the text before it was finalized.

The end result, unsurprisingly, is an agreement that is bad for the American people and would affect their daily lives in countless ways. American workers would find themselves competing for jobs against workers in places like Vietnam, who make 65 cents an hour—65 cents an hour.

It is no wonder that this agreement would require the U.S. to import food that does not meet our own safety standards. It would mean more expensive prescription drugs for our seniors, and it would curtail policies meant to fight climate change.

Mr. Speaker, the TPP is 6,000 pages long. It is too big and covers too much. It has too many unintended consequences. There should be no rush to push this agreement through the House before the end of the year.

However, if this agreement is put on the floor this year, I will vote “no,” and I encourage all of my colleagues to do the same. Protect working families. Protect the American consumer. Protect our environment. Vote “no” on the TPP.

CONGRESS MUST ACT AFFIRMATIVELY TO PROTECT THE INTERNET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, unless the Congress acts affirmatively by the end of next week, the Obama administration will turn over the core functions of the Internet to an international body. We cannot allow this to happen.

Look at the consequences. Using domain names, we have control over the protection of free speech on the Internet. One of the real positive things of the development of this type of technology over the last 45 or 50 years has been that people have been able to express themselves the way they want to on the Internet and be able to get a huge worldwide audience. Now, I recognize that there is no truth meter on the Internet, but people who make ridiculous statements on the Internet end up getting denigrated in the court of public opinion anyhow.

Free speech is at stake here, but also the national security of our country is at stake. The core functions of the Internet, including control over domain names, should not be turned over to countries that do not have America's best interests or values at heart, like China or Russia or Iran. They have no protections for free speech, they have no value for free speech, and they will do what they want to to put censorship on the Internet, particularly as a way of controlling their own population within their country. If we don't act, that is going to be something that happens, and I think we can guarantee it.

Stopping this move by the Obama administration will also ensure that the

United States Government would maintain ownership and control over the dot-gov and dot-mil domain names. That is necessary to protect our national security.

Just think of what would happen if a hostile power like Iran would be able to get control of both the dot-gov and dot-mil domain names. They would be easier able to hack, they would be easier able to spread around propaganda and disinformation, and unwitting people would think that this is coming from the United States Government. How denigrating will that be? It will be huge, and I think we all know the answer to that.

Now, who is best able to protect a free and open Internet? It is the United States of America, with the protections that we have in our Bill of Rights. Those are protections that have made the Internet grow and flourish.

I tell the administration, if it ain't broke, don't fix it. The Internet ain't broke, but it will become broken if we have countries that do not have our values and stick their nose into the governance of the core functions of the Internet. It is kind of like a termite. You don't see the danger right when the termite starts eating away, but if you allow it to start eating away and don't send the exterminator out, sooner or later there is going to be a big-time problem. Let's keep the termite of hostile powers who don't share our values out of getting into the Internet.

Congress must act affirmatively. We have to stop this from happening, and we don't have much time to do it.

FIND A SOLUTION SO ALL AMERICANS CAN HAVE CONTINUED ACCESS TO AN OPEN AND FREE INTERNET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. YOUNG) for 5 minutes.

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, America is a compassionate country. We are a very giving country. America gives a lot. But I am not sure we need to be giving away a free and open Internet.

If Congress does not act soon, our free and open Internet is going to be handed over by our President to a global bureaucratic body, a body that may not respect the freedom of information and speech that we experience today, a body that may sensor what Americans have to say or how journalists can receive information and cover certain stories on governments, on current events.

What does handing the Internet over to a global bureaucracy mean for privacy? for freedom of information? commerce? national security? The question is really: What is the need to do this, to hand over the administration of a working, free, and open Internet to a global bureaucracy? And why the rush?

Now, my colleagues, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. DUFFY) and we

just heard from the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER), are supporters of a great bill Mr. DUFFY introduced called the Protecting Internet Freedom Act, H.R. 5418. It has many sponsors on it. There are efforts in the Senate as well to do the same thing to protect the Internet.

In 2014, the National Telecommunications and Information Administration, the NTIA, announced its intention to relinquish, to give away, its procedural authority over Internet domain and functions to the global Internet stakeholder community. Many of the Iowans I represent, and I know many others around the country, are incredibly concerned about this—and rightly so—about shifting U.S. oversight and giving authority to regimes that have repeatedly censored the Internet.

As a member of the Appropriations Committee, I have worked with my colleagues to try to block funding for the administration's appeal to do this, this bogus plan, and I am hopeful U.S. Internet protections will remain in any final spending bill coming up. Mr. Speaker, the proper place for debate over important issues like this, like the integrity of the Internet, is here in Congress, not behind closed doors at the NTIA, a Federal agency, with these unilateral actions.

I urge my colleagues and I urge my fellow Americans to reach out to the Members of Congress and tell them and ask them and plead with them to protect the Internet, to make sure it is free and it is open, and to find a solution so that Iowans and all Americans have continued access to an open and free Internet, uncensored, where information can flourish and speech can flourish.

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT WILL GIVE UP CONTROL OF THE INTERNET IN 9 DAYS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. DUFFY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. DUFFY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my great concern that in a mere 9 days the United States Government is going to give up control of the Internet. This is one of those issues that I don't think many Americans know about. This is not on the front page above the fold of your paper. It is not splashed across your nightly news. You are not seeing it everywhere on the Internet. So Americans aren't really aware of it 9 days before this transfer is about to take place.

Now, as the Speaker knows, there are many things in this House both parties don't always agree on—that might be an understatement. The President just transferred \$1.7 billion to Iran; \$400 million, arguably, was Iranian money, but \$1.3 billion was American money, U.S. taxpayer money, transferred to Iran, the lead sponsor of Tehran cash. I disagree with that. Some of my colleagues on the other side might ap-

plaud that and think that is a great idea. I would disagree.

Or the fact that we are releasing prisoners from Guantanamo Bay. Folks who helped craft the 9/11 attack are being released from GTMO back to areas where they can do America more harm. I disagree with that. My friends across the aisle might agree with those releases. Those are some big items that this Chamber does not agree on.

But the transfer of control of the core functions of the Internet is something that many Members of this Chamber and many Americans agree with. It is going to transfer those core functions to an international foreign body that will include Russia and China and Iran and even Europe, transferring that control.

And let's make no mistake; the Internet was made in America. The Internet was paid for by American taxpayers at its point of invention, and the Internet has revolutionized the world, revolutionized the form in which we communicate. Not only is it great technology, but it embodies the American idea of freedom of speech. It is all open. Put out your ideas; some are good, some are bad, some are true, some are false, but it is free, just like that American idea of free speech. We have exported that freedom of speech idea to the rest of the world on the Internet, radically transformed the way people around the world communicate, and it was made in America with the American idea of free speech.

Now, 9 days from now, we are on the cusp of transferring its control to a foreign body that doesn't share that same idea of freedom of speech. We all know Russia doesn't share that idea, China doesn't share that idea, and Iran doesn't share that idea. But you might say, my friends, Europe, they share that idea, don't they? Not necessarily, they don't. They have rules in the European Union that will delineate hate speech and offensive speech that has to be taken off the Internet—not an American idea. That is a European idea of free speech.

But when you talk about offensive speech, offensive to whom? I could say, well, Catholics or Christians might hold certain positions and put certain things on the Internet that another group finds offensive, or the LGBT community might put something on the Internet that another group finds offensive. I am sorry. In a debate of ideas where you have a free flow, people can get offended, and that is okay.

□ 1100

But, to shut down speech that is offensive, even in the European model, frankly, to me, is offensive.

I think what we have to do in this body is to prevent the transfer. The Internet, I would argue, is U.S. Government property; and if the President is you-know-what-bent on transferring its control, it should come to this House and to the Senate. We should vote. We should have hearings and a debate.

In the end, the American people should see how their Senators and their House Members vote on the transfer of the core functions of the Internet. They should have a say. They should be able to petition their elected Representatives to say: I love the idea that you are going to transfer control to a global body that doesn't share our ideas, or, my goodness, stop the transfer.

Petition your elected Representatives, and let's have them take a vote. That is not going to happen. It is going to be transferred by the President—without a vote. I would ask all Americans to stand up, to push back, to fight back, and to make sure we maintain the great idea of the American and now global Internet.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 1 minute a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

Reverend Clarence A. Williams, Greater Mt. Zion African Methodist Episcopal Church, St. Petersburg, Florida, offered the following prayer:

Our Father and our God, we are grateful for this Nation, its vastness, its beauty. Truly, we live in a land of milk and honey. Help us, we pray, to protect and preserve it so that its grandeur and fullness always remains.

We are grateful for our people. A Nation of many cultures, from many different cultures, from many different races, many different religions, help us to love each other.

We are grateful for our history, a rich, gleaming heritage, a heritage born from a spirit to be free; one moment defending freedom, at other times struggling to find it. Forgive us for the times that we have missed the mark.

We are grateful for our leaders. Lord, bless the Members of this Chamber and the leadership of our great Nation. Help these Members own our country's problems and work to find solutions.

Finally, we are grateful for our future. Lord, bless the United States of America to be Your champion of righteousness that, supported by Thy powerful hand, we will establish Thy justice among nations and among men.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. 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.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HARDY) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. HARDY 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 CLARENCE A. WILLIAMS

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to welcome my friend and fellow Floridian, Reverend Clarence A. Williams to the House floor as our guest chaplain.

Pastor Williams is a lifelong public servant and trailblazing leader in the Tampa Bay community. He serves as the senior pastor of the Greater Mt. Zion AME Church in St. Petersburg, Florida, which I have the honor to represent here in the Congress.

Pastor Williams is a man of great wisdom and he is a man of action. In 2013, Pastor Williams formed Cross and Anvil Human Services, Inc., a nonprofit organization which works to close the educational, digital, and wealth gap for our neighbors in Tampa Bay. He is a founding member of Men in the Making, a youth mentoring organization; Life member of the NAACP; and board member of the Community Health Centers of Pinellas County.

His unwavering commitment to the St. Petersburg community is displayed daily in his advocacy for education, civil rights, and equal opportunity for all of our neighbors.

He is a native of Bartow, Florida, where he attended Bartow High School, and later Knoxville College in Knoxville, Tennessee. He is married to Mrs. Andrea P. Williams, and they have two lovely daughters.

Mr. Speaker, I ask everyone to join me in thanking Pastor Williams for leading today's opening prayer, and I thank him for his outstanding service to the St. Petersburg community.

HELPING REFUGEES REBUILD—INTERNATIONAL DAY OF PEACE

(Mr. HULTGREN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, on International Day of Peace, to applaud the efforts of Connect2Peace, the Peace Coalition the Rock River Valley, to draw attention to the plight of children and refugees whose lives have been forever disrupted by war.

Tonight, Rockford University and Connect2Peace will host a conversation on "How to Help Refugees Rebuild their World," featuring Melissa Fleming, the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees.

As chief spokesperson, Ms. Fleming speaks around the world on behalf of the more than 65 million vulnerable and voiceless people, half of which are children who are displaced from their homes by war, conflict, and persecution.

Helping refugees rebuild amid war and poverty is difficult and complicated, but there is hope. Groups like Kids Around the World in Rockford have stepped in to feed children and help them enjoy their disrupted childhood through donated playground sets.

People like Denny Johnson, founder of Kids Around the World, and U.N. Commissioner Melissa Fleming work tirelessly to bring hope into seemingly hopeless situations.

As an executive committee member for the Tom Lantos Human Rights Commission, today I urge us to pray and act for peace in our world.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee). The Chair will entertain up to 14 further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

HISPANIC HERITAGE MONTH

(Ms. HAHN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, every year, from September 15 to October 15, our Nation marks Hispanic Heritage Month to celebrate the enduring contribution of Latinos throughout our country's history.

I am proud to represent a district that has been shaped and bolstered by generations of Hispanic Americans as well as recent Latin American immigrants.

Los Angeles County is home to great Hispanic leaders, like Long Beach Mayor Robert Garcia, L.A. County Supervisor Hilda Solis, and State Senator Ricardo Lara. For the first time in history, our California State Legislature is led by two Latino lawmakers, Senate Pro Tem Kevin de Leon and Assembly Speaker Anthony Rendon.

California is proof that diversity is a strength and something we must recommit to and celebrate. That is why we must, as a nation, condemn attempts to demonize, marginalize, and scapegoat immigrant families. We are better than that as a country.

We need to stop playing politics with people's lives and finally do our jobs and pass comprehensive immigration reform that fixes our broken immigration system and lives up to our American values.

We can be better. Let us recommit to these values while we mark this year's Hispanic Heritage Month.

CONGRESSMAN JEFF MILLER HAS MADE A DIFFERENCE

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful that in my service I began as a member of the unique class of 2001. These were Members elected in special elections that year, including now-U.S. Senator JOHN BOOZMAN of Arkansas, along with chairman of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, JEFF MILLER of Florida, and chairman of the House Armed Services Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces, RANDY FORBES of Virginia, both of whom are now concluding their House service.

Since being elected to the House, Chairman JEFF MILLER has demonstrated his remarkable leadership as a member of the House Armed Services Committee, the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, and as chairman of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Chairman MILLER has been a dedicated advocate for troops, veterans, and military families. He has also worked tirelessly to hold the Department of Veterans Affairs accountable to ensure our servicemembers receive the best care. A Trump administration would have an excellent Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

I appreciate Chairman MILLER, his wife, Vicki, and his family for honorably serving the people of the First Congressional District of Florida. Roxanne and I will always treasure them as champions for American families.

Godspeed, JEFF and Vicki.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and may the President, by his actions, never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

AMERICAN ECONOMY IS STRONGER UNDER DEMOCRATIC PRESIDENTS

(Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, let's bury a myth, the persistent claim that Republicans are better at managing the economy than Democrats.

Under President Obama, we have come a long way since the dark days of the Bush-era Great Recession. And whether you look at the past 7½ years under President Obama or the past 70 years since Truman, the Democratic

record on the economy is very strong; the strong Democrat blue vs. red for the Republicans.

A recent study by Princeton University economists Alan Blinder and Mark Watson underscores this point. It shows that, since World War II, the economy has performed better under Democratic Presidents over Republican Presidents.

Blinder and Watson say it this way: "The U.S. economy has performed better when the President of the United States is a Democrat rather than a Republican, almost regardless of how one measures performance."

But Republicans still make the questionable claim that they do better at managing the economy. Let's put an end to that myth. Let's move to a more evidence-based discussion and bury the myth that Republicans are better at managing the economy.

The facts and the metrics speak for themselves; the strong blue Democratic record under Democratic Presidents managing the economy.

CONFRONTING THE ZIKA THREAT TO SOUTH FLORIDA

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, or CDC, lowered the travel warning for Zika in the Wynwood area to a cautionary travel guidance, which is consistent with the rest of the Miami-Dade County mainland. After comprehensive eradication efforts, there is no longer any evidence of active Zika transmissions in the area of Wynwood.

Though the situation in Wynwood has improved, the Zika zone has nearly tripled in Miami Beach, however. The CDC has now expanded the active Zika transmission warning zone for Miami Beach to a 4.5-square-mile area covering most of the city.

Mr. Speaker, even as we make significant progress in the fight against Zika, the threat remains persistent in south Florida. Congress must fund anti-Zika efforts now with no policy riders and without any more delay. This is an epidemic that we must eliminate once and for all.

South Florida families deserve better and they should not have to wait any longer for Federal funding. Let's pass a Zika funding bill now.

CELEBRATING THE 125TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE PUGET SOUND NAVAL SHIPYARD

(Mr. KILMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to mark the 125th anniversary of the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard.

If you come into Bremerton, Washington, by ferry, you see a big yellow

and blue slogan painted on the side of the shipyard's Building 460, and it says: "Puget Sound Naval Shipyard: Building on a Proud Tradition."

That proud tradition is based on the hard work of men and women who, for 125 years, have invested in their trades, shown up each day and gotten the job done for this country, and the uniformed personnel who have carried out the mission there.

Our shipyard workers serve our Nation and help keep our sailors and submariners safe. And through its long history, the shipyard has been central in building up our fleet during World War I, and repairing damaged ships during World War II, and throughout other wartime efforts. Today, they get our ships ready so the Navy can continue to provide strategic deterrence and peacekeeping all across the globe.

We live in a dangerous world where threats exist, and I have such admiration and respect for the role the shipyard and its workers play in protecting our servicemembers and protecting our Nation.

The future looks bright for this institution under the leadership of Captain Howard Markle. Recently I had the honor of speaking at the shipyard's apprenticeship graduation, and I can tell you that these folks are ready to carry on that proud tradition at the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard.

SUPPORT OUR NORTH COUNTRY APPLE FARMERS

(Ms. STEFANIK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. STEFANIK. Mr. Speaker, do you like apples?

Because I rise today to speak about that great time of year when days grow crisp and leaves start to change, apple season.

Agriculture is the backbone of our economy in the North Country, and New York State is the second largest-producing State in the country where we export our delicious products across the globe.

For most families, a trip apple picking is a great annual tradition this time of year. I have had the pleasure of touring apple orchards across my district, from Applejacks Orchards in Plattsburgh, to Forrence and Everett Orchards in Peru, to Kaneb Orchards in Massena.

Every year, during apple season, these orchards and many others in the North Country produce bushels and bushels of apples for eating as fresh fruit, to be made into juice and cider, and even to fill delicious apple pies.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to stand on the House floor today to support our North Country apple farmers.

□ 1215

FLINT, MICHIGAN

(Mr. KILDEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, in the next week or so, we will pass a spending bill to fund the government for the next 10 weeks, and it is absolutely critical that we include in that legislation funding to help my hometown of Flint recover from the terrible water crisis that it is facing. That should be included in the continuing resolution.

A city of 100,000 people, for 2 years, can't drink their water and are still dealing with the effects of lead poisoning. Hearings have been held in Congress, multiple committees, lots of sympathy, and Members asking me: What can I do? It is real simple. The Senate passed legislation that would provide relief for the people of Flint, 95-3, bipartisan legislation, paid for—let me emphasize—paid for. We have an offset.

Yet, House negotiators, on the continuing resolution, continue to take the position that we will consider relief for all sorts of issues, and we will get a spending bill, but nothing for Flint.

Take yes for an answer. When you asked us to come up with an offset to deal with this terrible public health crisis, we came up with an offset.

So to my colleagues, my God, at long last, do the right thing. Help this community that is struggling. We have come up with a way to get it done. There is no excuse for not getting it done. It has to happen now.

RECOGNIZING FIREBALL RUN ADVENTURE RALLY'S VISIT TO CURWENSVILLE

(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 in recognition of an event in Pennsylvania's Fifth Congressional District—and across New York, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Connecticut, and Massachusetts—raising awareness for missing children across our Nation.

Fireball Run is an 8-day, 2,000-mile road rally competition starting this Friday and running through Saturday, October 1. This Sunday, I will be joining the teams in Curwensville, located in Pennsylvania's Fifth Congressional District.

While I have been told that the race itself is a lot of fun, what really impresses me about the Fireball Run is the effort made to raise awareness for missing children across the United States of America.

Every driving team is assigned a child missing from their home area, in addition to being provided 1,000 missing child flyers to distribute along their 2,000-mile journey. Since the start of Fireball Run 10 years ago, the campaign has aided in the recovery of 44 missing children.

I commend everyone involved in Fireball Run for their selfless efforts in raising awareness for this important issue, and I wish them the best of luck and safety as their journey begins on Friday.

COMMEMORATING 100TH BIRTHDAY OF EASTERN STATES EXPOSITION

(Mr. NEAL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the Eastern States Exposition held annually in West Springfield, Massachusetts. Founded in 1916, the Eastern States Exposition, more affectionately known as "The Big E," for a century has been a showcase for what all six New England States have to offer. Starting last Friday and running for a total of 17 days, this celebration will play host to hundreds of agricultural and livestock displays, thousands of food and craft vendors, and will welcome over 1 million visitors through its duration.

Mr. Speaker, there is no denying that The Big E is woven into the culture of western Massachusetts. Furthermore, it is a driving force behind the regional tourism economy.

I wish to congratulate Eastern States Chairman Donald Chase, President Eugene Cassidy, and the many staff and volunteers on the work done in preparation for this centennial celebration. May this year stand as a testament to the next 100 years. Congratulations from the United States of America.

NATIONAL ESTUARY WEEK

(Mr. POSEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POSEY. Mr. Speaker, this week we recognize National Estuary Week, a week dedicated to raising awareness of the importance of our Nation's estuaries.

The Eighth District of Florida is home to the Indian River Lagoon, one of the most diverse estuaries in North America and the world. Stretching 156 miles along Florida's east coast, our lagoon is a sanctuary for nearly 4,000 species of wildlife, an economic engine for our community, and an invaluable recreational and educational resource for residents and visitors. Since estuaries are places where freshwater mixes with saltwater, preserving the delicate balance is as critical as it can be difficult.

Many estuaries, including our lagoon, are experiencing challenges like harmful algae blooms, declines in sea grass, and invasive species. These threats require our immediate attention.

This week, millions of Americans will show their commitment to our estuaries through volunteer efforts. We all have a role to play in caring for our

environment. It is a matter of awareness and of action.

CONDEMNING RESTRICTIVE VOTING LAWS

(Ms. NORTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, Congress is about to go home for the most important event in any democracy: the November 8 elections. We will leave a cloud over our democracy in failing to update the 1965 Voting Rights Act, recommended by the Supreme Court, when it struck down section 4 requiring Federal preclearance of State laws with a history of discrimination.

My resolution, H. Res. 846, condemning restrictive voting laws, documents that no sooner was preclearance overturned than States galloped to pass new onerous voting restrictions. So unconstitutional were these laws that not only in southern States but also, even without the preclearance process, they have been struck down in four States: Texas, North Carolina, Wisconsin, and Ohio.

Seldom has Congress had so much real-time evidence of the need to renew legislation. The evidence is a virtual mandate for Congress to make history again and update our democracy by updating the Voting Rights Act.

UNSUSTAINABLE OVERTIME RULE

(Mr. HARDY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, we have heard from countless small businesses, colleges and universities, nonprofits, and the public sector that the recent Department of Labor's overtime rule change is not sustainable.

In a few short months, employers will be forced to accept a 100 percent increase in the salary threshold. This rule has the potential to result in the unintended consequences that impact an employee's hours being reduced, employees being switched to hourly status and thus a reduction in benefits, or worse.

This change has the potential to devastate many businesses and their employers. With our country still slogging through a recovery, such a dramatic increase is misguided and ill-advised.

Mr. Speaker, the House has held multiple hearings, we have authored various letters, and legislation has been drafted on the rule. It must not go into effect as planned this year.

RECOGNIZING LIFE AND LEGACY OF JAMES O'NEILL

(Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the life and legacy of the late James O'Neill. James was a giant in the law enforcement community in my home district in the Hudson Valley. We lost him suddenly on Sunday, July 17, at the age of 59, of an apparent heart attack. On that day, though, we didn't just lose a friend but we also lost a father, a husband, and an icon in the New York City and Putnam County police communities.

Jimmy was born and raised in the Bronx. He was a graduate of Visitation School and of Cardinal Hayes High School. He joined the NYPD in 1979. He lived a life devoted to service and dedicated nearly 30 years to the New York Police Department before retiring as a detective and squad supervisor in 1999. He went on to become a founding member of the New York Shields and president of the Fraternal Order of Police in Putnam County.

He was an outspoken leader whose efforts involved working with officers suffering from mental and emotional effects of serving in the force. He was an icon in the police community, and he was the consummate cop's cop. He not only devoted his own career as a police officer and a detective to serving others but, even after his retirement, he devoted himself in so many ways to helping other officers and their families in times of need.

I want to send my personal condolences to Jimmy's wife, Kathy, and his son, James, along with their dear friends, Joanne Viola, Henry Primus, John McCardle, and Paul Curtin, all of whom have joined us here today. We are honored by your presence.

The law enforcement community, Hudson Valley, and New York have lost one of their finest, and he will be sorely missed. The beauty of Jimmy's life can be summed up by this: he loved his family beyond all measure, gave all to his friends and community, and was the most humble and decent man anyone can say they ever knew. His absence is a chasm that we will never fill.

STARBUCKS UPSTANDERS

(Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank Starbucks and their new program called the Upstanders series for recognizing Baldwin Community Schools and the Baldwin Promise.

The Upstanders series was created by Starbucks to showcase uplifting American stories. I believe that Starbucks found a uniquely inspiring story to tell when they highlighted Baldwin, Michigan.

Baldwin Community Schools was designated as a Michigan Promise Zone in 2009, meaning that every child who attended school in Baldwin has a tuition-free path to a college education. Earning this designation took commitment

and sacrifice from the entire Baldwin community. In order to be designated, the village of Baldwin had to privately fundraise over \$100,000.

Baldwin looked within for those donations, even though it is located in Lake County, the 22nd poorest county in the Nation, where more than 24 percent of the residents live below the poverty level. They not only hit their goal, but they exceeded their goal. In fact, they raised more than \$160,000 than what the goal had been.

The people of Baldwin and their commitment to their community, one another, and, more importantly, future generations truly is exemplified by this story.

I would like to thank Starbucks again for what they have done to highlight that. This is really what community in west Michigan is all about. I want to thank them again for creating this series and then recognizing Baldwin and sharing that story with the Nation.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION'S NEW FRONTIERS

(Mr. MCNERNEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the development of new frontiers in the area of seismology and the study of the Earth's interior. Most studies of seismic waves have been limited to surface-based exploration due to ease of installation. But the NSF recently funded a dense, underground, three-dimensional array of 13 high-sensitivity broadband seismometers at the Homestake mine in South Dakota.

This ambitious project will give rise to new seismic data analysis techniques and aid in the design of future underground gravitational-wave detectors, which will lead to breakthroughs in seismic noise tomography. These discoveries will have a broad range of applications, ranging from medical diagnoses, detection of mineral and oil deposits, and homeland security.

I commend the National Science Foundation in their efforts to keep the United States at the forefront of technical advancement and scientific breakthroughs through its projects.

HONORING TEXAS TECH BASEBALL

(Mr. NEUGEBAUER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 2016 Texas Tech Red Raider baseball team. The Red Raiders, led by Big 12 coach of year, Tim Tadlock, capped off a tremendous season in which they won the Big 12 title and advanced to the College World Series for the second time in the past 3 years. This trip, they earned the

program's first-ever win in Omaha. This team's hard work was evident as I watched their impressive run.

I want to highlight the contributions of the senior class, a group who led Tech to 149 wins since 2013. Several of these players have moved on to professional baseball careers, and we wish all of them the best in their future endeavors. This team ended the year ranked number 4 nationally, Tech's highest ranking in school history. I am especially proud of the way these young men carried themselves in victory and defeat.

Under the guidance of Coach Tadlock and his staff, next year's team should be well positioned to carry on Tech's recent baseball success.

Red Raider nation and I thank you for the way you represented the university.

□ 1230

VETERAN SUICIDE PREVENTION MONTH

(Mrs. BUSTOS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commemorate Veteran Suicide Prevention Month.

Today, after more than a decade of war, a new generation of veterans is facing real challenges. No man or woman who has sacrificed so much for our country should return home feeling alone or feeling like there is nowhere to turn. Far too often, that is the reality in which our veterans live. In fact, every single day, 20 veterans commit suicide.

During the last decade, nearly a third of veterans treated at VA medical centers had been diagnosed with PTSD. We have to do better. That is why I was proud to be a cosponsor of the Clay Hunt Suicide Prevention Act last year to increase resources for veterans and improve oversight of the VA.

I am working closely with veterans service organizations in our district to ensure that all veterans receive the high-quality care that they have earned and deserve. This month, it is my hope that our awareness can finally turn into meaningful action for our veterans.

MISGUIDED OVERTIME RULE

(Mr. BUCSHON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to the Department of Labor's misguided overtime rule because it will undoubtedly harm Hoosier small businesses, nonprofits, universities, and the jobs they support.

We all agree our Nation's overtime rules should be updated; however, this administration has proposed a rule that will stifle job growth, limit oppor-

tunity, and lead to less hours and flexibility for Hoosier workers.

The director of an Indiana-based nonprofit that aids individuals with physical and mental disabilities recently said the new rule will have dire consequences for the organization's workers. That is why I am proud to support H.R. 4773 and H.J. Res. 95, to stop implementation of this rule, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

LET'S PASS A CLEAN ZIKA FUNDING BILL

(Mr. GALLEGO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Speaker, 19,000 and counting, that is the number of people with confirmed cases of Zika in America so far; 1,800 and counting, the number of pregnant women in the U.S. with confirmed cases of Zika so far; 17 and counting, the number of babies born with birth defects related to the Zika virus so far; 6 months and counting, that is how long ago President Obama asked Congress to do its job and provide supplemental funding to combat the virus.

Mr. Speaker, how many more Americans must suffer before the House Republicans realize that the health of our families matters more than politics? How many more pregnant women must receive the devastating news they have contracted the virus before the GOP leadership stops playing games with American lives?

Instead of heeding the pleas of the CDC, public health experts, and the medical community, House Republicans revealed their true priorities when they decided to hold Zika funding hostage over women's health care and the Confederate flag.

That is just wrong, Mr. Speaker. Let's protect pregnant women. Let's save vulnerable infants. Let's pass a clean Zika funding bill.

THERE IS A MASS KILLING

(Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, our Nation is witness to a silent mass killing every day this year. This year, more than 250,000 Americans have lost their lives so far, but the public never knew it. It has never been on the front page of The New York Times or The Washington Post, and it is not discussed on CNN or FOX.

Tomorrow, this mass killing will continue. And every day we allow it, over 900 more will die. With 100 days left this year, nearly 100,000 American lives are on the line unless we take immediate action.

As we sit and watch this tragedy from our comfortable offices, I wonder if my colleagues have statements prepared for the thousands of parents and siblings and friends who lost or will

lose a loved one in this mass killing back home. I wonder how we will look families in the eye when we leave Washington and say, there wasn't enough time, we wanted to go home, and yet those who died will never go home.

Mr. Speaker, there is time if we act today. I ask the Senate to stop the tragedy and please call up and pass H.R. 2646, the Helping Families in Mental Health Crisis Act, because where there is help, there is hope.

HELPING FLORIDA'S ORANGE AND CITRUS FARMERS

(Ms. GRAHAM asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, my home State of Florida is well known for the best tasting orange juice that I am fortunate to have grown up drinking, and we sell that orange juice across our great country. But today, our citrus farmers and orange industry are experiencing a crisis unparalleled to anything we have seen in the last century.

Citrus greening—an invasive disease that ravages citrus plants—has steadily taken its toll on Florida citrus, and it is spreading to other States, too. That is why I am proud to support the Emergency Citrus Disease Response Act, which would allow citrus growers to deduct the cost of replacing lost or damaged citrus plants from their taxes.

This Congress must work together across party lines to do all we can to help Florida's orange and citrus farmers. This legislation will help them afford the new trees they need to restore our citrus crop so we can all keep drinking the best orange juice ever.

TREATING INDIVIDUALS FACING SERIOUS DISEASE OR DISABILITY EQUALLY UNDER THE LAW

(Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 670, the Special Needs Trust Fairness Act, which I have cosponsored. This bill would allow non-elderly individuals with a disability to create a special needs trust for themselves, as opposed to needing a relative or guardian to create such a trust for them.

Importantly, these trusts would also be exempt from being considered as an asset when an individual applies for eligibility for Medicaid benefits, meaning the individual with the special needs trust can still be eligible for Medicaid benefits.

This legislation would make a straightforward correction in Federal law that would ensure all individuals facing serious disease or disability are treated equally under the law and are able to manage their lives with independence.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues for acting to advance this bill.

HONORING A MINNESOTA HERO

(Mr. EMMER of Minnesota asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. EMMER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and thank a true American hero, Jason Falconer, for his bravery during a time of grave crisis in Minnesota.

This past weekend, terror struck our community when an attacker, whom the Islamic State took responsibility for, stepped into the Crossroads Center mall in St. Cloud with an evil intention: to kill innocent Minnesotans. The targets of this malicious plan were parents and their children, college students taking a break from their studies, and mall employees, all of whom found themselves suddenly trapped in a horrible nightmare.

This cowardly attacker had already stabbed 10 victims and may have succeeded in taking life if it were not for the heroic actions of an off-duty Avon police officer, Jason Falconer, who confronted and shot the attacker-terrorist before he could do more harm.

Mr. Speaker, words cannot adequately express the gratitude those of us in my State have for Jason Falconer. He stepped in when he was needed most and protected those around him without even the slightest hesitation or concern for his own safety. During such troubling times, it is a comfort to know that there are true heroes like Jason Falconer among us.

Thank you, Jason, and God bless you.

SPACE TANGO

(Mr. BARR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a cutting-edge space technology company located in the Sixth Congressional District of Kentucky. Space Tango has an innovative business model that utilizes the unique environment of microgravity to commercialize new discoveries in exomedicine for various applications on Earth.

Space Tango established a test center called TangoLab1, a reconfigurable experiment ecosystem designed for microgravity research aboard the International Space Station. The company, ably led by CEO Twyman Clements and Chairman Kris Kimel, leases this space and provides technical assistance for research across several scientific fields. Space Tango provides realtime data and commanding capabilities using an end-to-end cloud-based portal as well as environmental telemetry and power consumption.

I recently had the privilege of visiting the offices of Space Tango in my hometown of Lexington, Kentucky, and learned firsthand from Twyman and Kris and their entire team about the

innovative work of this impressive company. I am convinced that, with this technology, we will find the next lifesaving, life-improving medical breakthroughs, and it will happen somewhere other than on planet Earth.

I am proud to say that Space Tango and many other aerospace companies call the Sixth Congressional District of Kentucky home, and I am excited to see what innovations and groundbreaking discoveries they will make in the future, both on Earth and beyond.

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, September 21, 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 September 21, 2016 at 9:10 a.m.:

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 5252.

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 2615.

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 5937.

That the Senate passed S. 3076.

Appointment:

Public Interest Declassification Board.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5461, IRANIAN LEADERSHIP ASSET TRANSPARENCY ACT

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 876 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 876

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. 5461) to require the Secretary of the Treasury to submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees on the estimated total assets under direct or indirect control by certain senior Iranian leaders and other figures, 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 Financial Services. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. No

amendment to the bill 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. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommend with or without instructions.

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 Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), 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.

□ 1245

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, as I was listening to the Reading Clerk read through the rule, it sounded a little restrictive. Today, I went back and referenced my notes just to make sure that I was right. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 876 is a structured rule, but it provides for the consideration of absolutely every amendment submitted to the Rules Committee on H.R. 5461, the Iranian Leadership Asset Transparency Act. Every single amendment that was submitted by this body to the Rules Committee for approval was approved and will be made in order by this rule.

The underlying bill requires the Secretary of the Treasury to submit a report to Congress and make that report available online in its nonclassified parts—obviously, the classified parts would be restricted to Members of Congress—that estimates the total assets under direct or indirect control of senior Iranian leaders, including those with ties to the Iranian Revolutionary Guard Corps.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, it is well-documented that many of Iran's political and military leaders have amassed substantial personal wealth on the backs of the citizens of Iran. It gives them control over all sorts of sectors of the Iranian economy. In fact, the non-partisan Congressional Research Serv-

ice estimates that one-third of the Iranian economy—that includes telecommunications; it includes construction; it includes airports; it includes seaports—is controlled by leaders personally in the government—these political and military elites—through what they will call personal foundations.

Mr. Speaker, the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action—that is what most of America knows as the Iran deal, signed by President Obama—has allowed many Iranian entities that are tied to government corruption to be removed from the list of entities that American businesses are prohibited from doing business with—those businesses sanctioned by the U.S. Government. Given the large agreement that we have in this Chamber that the Iranian Government is embracing corruption at every level, it is clear that much of the foreign investment from U.S. companies should be limited but is not under the current regime. What is more, U.S. businesses today that are able to invest in Iran are doing so without any of the knowledge of whom they are supporting and what kinds of corruption may be involved. That is bad news for America. It is bad news for American national security, and it is bad news for the American economy.

H.R. 5461 will shine a light on that internal Iranian corruption, and it will allow American businesses the information they need to determine whom and whom not to do business with. We may hear today in the underlying bill, Mr. Speaker, that these requirements are too burdensome. I tell you that that is nonsense. It is simply a request that the Department of the Treasury, using existing resources—public resources—as well as our classified resources, make this report to Congress. We are talking about only 80 folks. We are talking about the Supreme Leader of Iran; we are talking about the President of Iran; we are talking about members of the Council of Guardians in Iran; we are talking about the Expediency Council and about two dozen Revolutionary Guard Corps leaders.

In the war on terror, in the quest for transparency, I am certain that the United States Government, through the Department of the Treasury, can provide this information. We may hear in the underlying debate that such information will expose our intelligence sources overseas—again, nonsense. There is not a single Member of this Chamber, from left to right, who wants to do that. No one wants to do that. Anything that is in a classified setting that needs to remain in a classified setting will, in fact, remain in a classified setting.

Mr. Speaker, if you have any of those concerns—in fact, if any Member of this Chamber has any of those concerns—I invite him to support this rule. Again, with the passage of this rule, we will move to the underlying bill. We will have a full-fledged debate on that underlying bill, including a debate over every single amendment offered for consideration in this body.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the rule and to support the underlying bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

(Mr. MCGOVERN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL) for the customary 30 minutes.

With all that we have to do, I can't believe we are here doing this; nonetheless, here we are today, considering H.R. 5461, the so-called Iranian Leadership Asset Transparency Act.

This bill would require the Secretary of the Treasury to report to Congress and post online the estimated total assets under the direct or indirect control of certain senior Iranian leaders and other figures, along with a description of how these assets were acquired and are employed, regardless of whether said figures are subject to U.S. sanctions.

The fact is that this bill—and let's be clear about it—is nothing more than another attempt by Republicans to undermine the historic agreement the United States worked so hard to achieve to prevent Iran from obtaining nuclear weapons. Preventing Iran from obtaining nuclear weapons is a big deal. I am sorry my colleagues on the other side of the aisle don't share that view, but it is a big deal. The world will be safer with a nuclear-free Iran.

Last July, the United States, the United Kingdom, France, Russia, China, Germany—the P5+1—and Iran agreed to the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, which required Iran to abandon its nuclear program in exchange for U.S., EU, and U.N. sanctions being lifted. The agreement officially came into effect on October 18, 2015. U.S. nuclear-related sanctions were lifted on January 16, 2016, after the International Atomic Energy Agency verified that Iran implemented its key nuclear-related measures described in the agreement and the Secretary of State confirmed the IAEA's verification.

Since the implementation of the agreement, Republicans have repeatedly tried to create the impression of numerous scandals surrounding Iran and of supposed violations of the agreement; but the reality is that the agreement has, so far, prevented Iran from developing a nuclear arsenal. While we will continue to counter Iran's hostile activities in the region, we will not undermine the JCPOA.

H.R. 5461 would absolutely do nothing to increase transparency within the Iranian financial industry. Rather, this bill would cause confusion regarding compliance obligations, deter non-U.S. banks from reengaging with legitimate Iranian business, and undermine the letter and spirit of the nuclear agreement the United States worked so hard to achieve.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the Statement of Administration Policy, which basically ends with this statement, that if the President were presented with this bill, his senior advisers would recommend that he veto this bill.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY
H.R. 5461—IRANIAN LEADERSHIP ASSET TRANSPARENCY ACT—REP. POLIQUIN, R-ME, AND ONE COSPONSOR

The Administration shares the Congress' goals of increasing transparency and bringing Iran into compliance with international standards in the global fight against terror finance and money laundering. However, this bill would be counterproductive toward those shared goals.

The bill requires the U.S. Government to publicly report all assets held by some of Iran's highest leaders and to describe how these assets are acquired and used. Rather than preventing terrorist financing and money laundering, this bill would incentivize those involved to make their financial dealings less transparent and create a disincentive for Iran's banking sector to demonstrate transparency. These onerous reporting requirements also would take critical resources away from the U.S. Department of the Treasury's important work to identify Iranian entities engaged in sanctionable conduct. Producing this information could also compromise intelligence sources and methods.

One of our best tools for impeding destabilizing Iranian activities has been to identify Iranian companies that are controlled by the Islamic Revolutionary Guards Corps (IRGC) or other Iranians on the list of Specially Designated Nationals and Blocked Persons (SDN List) to non-U.S. businesses, so that they can block assets or stop material transfers. This process is labor-intensive and requires the judicious use of our national intelligence assets. Redirecting these assets to preparing this onerous public report would be counterproductive and will not reduce institutional corruption or promote transparency within Iran's system.

In addition, this bill's required public postings also may be perceived by Iran and likely our Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA) partners as an attempt to undermine the fulfillment of our commitments, in turn impacting the continued viability of this diplomatic arrangement that peacefully and verifiably prevents Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapon. If the JCPOA were to fail on that basis, it would remove the unprecedented constraints on and monitoring of Iran's nuclear program, lead to the unraveling of the international sanctions regime against Iran, and deal a devastating blow to the credibility of America's leadership and our commitments to our closest allies.

As we address our concerns with Iran's nuclear program through implementation of the JCPOA, the Administration remains clear-eyed regarding Iran's support for terrorism, its ballistic missile program, human rights abuses, and destabilizing activity in the region. The United States should retain all of the tools needed to counter this activity, ranging from powerful sanctions to our efforts to disrupt and interdict illicit shipments of weapons and proliferation-sensitive technologies. This bill would adversely affect the U.S. Government's ability to wield these tools, would undermine the very goals it purports to achieve, and could even endanger our ability to ensure that Iran's nuclear program is and remains exclusively peaceful.

If the President were presented with H.R. 5461, his senior advisers would recommend that he veto this bill.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, this bill is going nowhere. Quite frankly, I think it is an insult to the American people that we are bringing up more and more bills that are going nowhere when we have so much here to do. Congress has roughly a week before we recess again, and instead of focusing on passing a bipartisan bill to actually fund the government, House Republicans are wasting more time with partisan bills like this, and it really is quite unfortunate.

But, since Republicans want to talk about transparency so much, let's talk about the transparency—or the total lack of transparency—of their Presidential nominee, Donald Trump. I have got to tell you that I have been doing this a long time, and I think it is safe to say that Donald Trump's lack of transparency would make Richard Nixon blush.

For 40 years, America's major party nominees have publicly released their tax returns, a simple and basic disclosure made to the American people to help them choose which candidate is best fit to be our next President. Donald Trump, the nominee of the party that is telling us today that they care so much about transparency, has repeatedly refused to release his tax returns. This comes even after he promised in 2014 that he "absolutely"—and I say that in quotes—would release them if he ran for President.

Let's be honest. In this House of Representatives, if Hillary Clinton refused to release her tax returns, there would be an outcry like you have never heard from my Republican friends. There would be calls for hearings and resolutions and probably even a vote to impeach her retroactively once she was elected. We all know that. But, on Donald Trump's lack of transparency—the guy who wants to be President of the United States—they are silent.

The secrecy and the lack of transparency doesn't stop with Donald Trump's tax returns. This month, Newsweek reported on how Donald Trump's extensive financial dealings overseas would pose an unprecedented conflict of interest that could threaten our national security and global interests.

In the article, they write:

Never before has a business posed such a threat to the United States. If Donald Trump wins this election and his company is not immediately shut down or forever severed from the entire Trump family, the foreign policy of the United States of America could well be for sale.

The Trump Organization has hundreds of business dealings involving more than a dozen countries on five continents, including Russia, India, Turkey, Libya, China, and South Korea. Newsweek warns that, as long as The Trump Organization remains open, foreign governments and businesses would be able to funnel money directly into the pockets of Trump and his family. That means American foreign policy would be literally for sale.

It is a situation unlike anything we have ever seen in American history.

For example, Trump's business deals could motivate him to abandon NATO allies like Turkey and important Asian allies like South Korea. His deals in Azerbaijan could force him to alter his position on Iran or undermine U.S. relations with Armenia. His deals in India could influence his position over longstanding conflicts with Pakistan—in a volatile subcontinent where both nations have nuclear weapons.

When it comes to Russia, there are concerns about Trump's heaping praise and praise and praise on an increasingly hostile foreign leader, Russian President Vladimir Putin, at the same time his company is seeking business opportunities in Russia and how that conflict of interest could evolve if Trump were President of the United States.

Newsweek also reports that the friction caused by Trump's business dealings could jeopardize relationships with our allies like Turkey in the fight against ISIS. Additionally, one of Trump's business partners is a South Korean company that is involved in nuclear energy, which makes you wonder if that is why he suggested South Korea should have nuclear weapons.

So, if you want to talk about transparency and if you are worried about conflicts of interest and corruption, you ought to demand that the nominee of your party come clean with the American people. You ought to demand that he release his tax returns, that he make it clear that he would end all of his business ties if, God forbid, he would become President of the United States, which is something that, I hope, we never, ever get close to.

The bottom line is that that is something that is real and is right before us, and, quite frankly, we ought to be doing more about it. We shouldn't be wasting the American people's time with more partisan messaging bills that claim to be about transparency—bills that are going absolutely nowhere. We should focus on passing a bipartisan funding bill that keeps this government open and that takes real action to combat the very real Zika virus and other public health crises that Americans are actually confronting.

I urge the Members of both parties to defeat this rule and get back to work on real issues that actually matter in the lives of the people whom we represent.

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

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask the gentleman from Massachusetts if he has any further speakers remaining.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I would just inform the gentleman that we have one additional speaker who says he is on his way.

Mr. WOODALL. I tell the gentleman I, too, have a rumored speaker who is on his way, so we are in the same boat in that space.

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

I read further from the Statement of Administration Policy, the veto threat that the gentleman from Massachusetts noted earlier.

□ 1300

He did read the section that said: If the President were presented with H.R. 5461, his senior advisers would recommend that he veto the bill.

There is more on this page, Mr. Speaker. He also says: “. . . the Administration remains clear-eyed regarding Iran’s support for terrorism, its ballistic missile program, human rights abuses, and destabilizing activity in the region.”

Now, Mr. Speaker, what he is referencing, no doubt, ties into the report that the State Department released over the summer, naming Iran the number one international sponsor of terrorism.

Now, what this bill asks is: If you know you have a corrupt government—again, in the administration’s words, Iran’s support for terrorism, its ballistic program, its human rights abuses, and its destabilizing activity in the region—if you know that you have a dangerous government and if you know that corrupt leaders of that government are hiding their resources in foundations across the nation, if you know that those foundations are controlling a third of the Iranian economy, continuing to keep its foot on the voice of the Iranian people, if you know that this is true, why won’t you stand up and be counted?

My friend from Massachusetts says we shouldn’t waste our time on this because it is going nowhere. Candidly, I believe leadership is taking those things that folks believe are going nowhere and making them a reality. That is what the President did with this Iran deal.

When I go back and think about the polling that was going on across the Nation while the President was pushing this deal around the globe, there was no more unpopular agreement with the American people. The American people were livid that we would be making a deal to perpetuate the power and control structure in Iran, but the President led on that. He forced that through. I don’t believe we ever got a majority of the American people behind it, but he got a majority of the Congress to support him in that effort.

Mr. Speaker, this is about information. This is about information on a known sponsor of global terrorism. This is about providing information not just to American citizens, but to Iranian citizens. If you live in the nation of Iran, if you have that average annual income of \$15,000, Mr. Speaker, you might be interested to know how the other half lives. You might be interested to know, when your leaders are talking about the Great Satan on national television, where it is they are stuffing their pockets. You might be

interested to know, when folks are talking about you rising up to fight the Great Satan, where those folks have their relatives working, where their millions are growing, what parts of the economy they are controlling. That is all this bill is going to ask for.

Again, Mr. Speaker, we are here to debate the rule today. The rule makes it in order to consider the underlying bill as well as every single amendment that has been offered by both sides of the aisle to perfect the underlying bill.

Again, I urge my colleagues to be enthusiastic in their support of the underlying bill and of the rule.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I would just respond to the gentleman that the reason why the administration wants to veto this bill has nothing to do with the fact that they aren’t concerned about Iran’s role in promoting terrorist organizations around the world or being involved in very bad behavior.

I think they are opposed to this bill because they don’t think it is worth anything; that it is not going to work. In fact, rather than preventing terrorist financing and money laundering, this bill would actually incentivize those affected to make their financial dealings less transparent and create a disincentive for Iran’s banking sector to demonstrate transparency.

Look, we are all talking about this like this is all on the level. The real deal is that my friends on the other side are upset that the President of the United States negotiated a deal with Iran that prevents them from getting a nuclear weapon. So we see a multitude of bills like this coming to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question. And if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up legislation that would expand the Department of Homeland Security’s presence overseas.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation would strengthen DHS’s operations by authorizing and expanding Department of Homeland Security, Customs and Border Protection, and Immigration and Customs Enforcement programs that vet and screen individuals before they enter the United States. It would add an additional 2,000 Customs and Border Protection officers for overseas and domestic operations.

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 (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, to discuss our proposal, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Homeland Security.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) for allowing me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote “no” and defeat the previous question so we can bring up my bill, H.R. 5256, the Expanding DHS Overseas Passenger Security Screening and Vetting Operations Act.

Mr. Speaker, everybody we have talked to within the Homeland Security arena says that, as Americans, we are safer if we can push our borders out. So the notion that we should wait on the bad guys to get here is a notion that obviously would put us in harm’s way.

So what we are proposing with this bill is enhancing the ability for us to push our borders out. We have had examples of this. They have all been successful. So this is another effort to resource the opportunity to make sure that our borders not only are just safe, but as safe from American soil as possible.

So 15 years ago, Mr. Speaker, foreign terrorists carried out the most deadly and costly terrorist act on U.S. soil. We committed ourselves to creating the Department of Homeland Security. We resourced it. We put a number of agencies together. We are on a day-to-day basis tracking bad people all over the world, preventing bad people from getting into the United States. To the credit of our men and women, they are doing a good job, but we are only as good as the resources that we put to fight terrorism.

So this, again, is one of the tools in the toolkit that we have identified that we have to have, which is to push our borders out so that we can not only keep Americans safe, but we can, through our enhanced vetting process, keep bad people out.

So as the 9/11 Commission reported, the terrorists that carried out this heinous act on 9/11 were able to exploit legitimate channels of travel to the U.S. from countries around the globe. There is no question about that. To prevent terrorist travel, the Department of Homeland Security has made significant efforts to expand its presence and partnerships around the world to vet passengers well in advance of their arrival to the U.S.

For instance, Mr. Speaker, there are over 200 airports around the world. The last-point-of-departure airports, to speak of, where unless we can vet all those individuals who are trying to come here, they can’t get on the plane. So what we are trying to do is continue to enhance that effort and others to make sure that anyone trying to get to this country—and we can identify that they are bad people—that we will keep them away.

My legislation, Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5256, will strengthen these operations to deal with evolving terrorist threats, including the threats posed by individuals traveling without visas from European and other countries with visa waiver agreements with the U.S.

Now, to prevent these terrorists and other dangerous people from entering the U.S., Mr. Speaker, this legislation directs DHS to strategically expand its program that vets and screens travelers. It specifically authorizes key DHS vetting and screening programs. It also provides for an additional 2,000 Customs and Border Protection officers for not only overseas operations, but also to address domestic shortages, particularly at U.S. international airports.

Mr. Speaker, even as we absorb the events of this weekend where Americans carried out terrorist attacks in Minnesota, New York, and New Jersey, we must do all we can to prevent foreign terrorists, including an estimated 3,000 Europeans trained as foreign fighters by ISIL, from entering the United States.

Defeating the previous question, Mr. Speaker, will allow Members to consider my bill, H.R. 5256, that will do just that. Again, Mr. Speaker, we are only as good as we resource the Department to fight terrorism.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from the great State of Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN), one of the great leaders of this conference.

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I do want to commend the gentleman from Georgia for the great work that he does on the Rules Committee. Once again, he has done yeoman's work on this legislation before us.

Frankly, I have some reservations about the underlying bill, but I do respect the goal of this legislation. I also respect the gentleman from Mississippi in his efforts to come up with some legislation so that we can have enhanced interrogation of certain people wanting to come into this country. I think almost everyone on this side of the aisle believes in more detailed vetting of people wanting to come here, especially from countries that we deem as dangerous.

I rise at this time, though, just to make the point that—in response to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), who spent almost his entire time talking about this bill, talking about the transparency of the Republican nominee for President, I also, though, might make the point that the Democratic nominee, Secretary Clinton, has refused for many months to release the transcripts or copies of her many speeches that she gave to Wall Street firms for really what most people would consider to be small fortunes. In addition to that, she has refused to give out details of the approximately 60 percent of the people she met with while Secretary of State who had contributed to the Clinton Foundation, in some cases, very large amounts of money from foreign countries, which really is possibly more closely related to this legislation than is the tax return of the Republican nominee.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

I would ask my colleagues respectfully to support us in our effort to defeat the previous question so we can bring up the legislation that Mr. THOMPSON mentioned, legislation that would strengthen the Department of Homeland Security's overseas screening and vetting programs.

I would like to think that even though Democrats and Republicans don't always agree on everything, we can agree on something and that this is something that we ought to be able to agree on, and hopefully we will be able to have a vote on it.

Again, I regret that we are bringing up a bill that, again, is another attempt to try to undermine the deal that we have brokered with other nations around the world to prevent Iran from becoming a nuclear power, but here we are yet with another bill. The President is going to veto it. We can continue to debate the merits, but it is kind of a waste of time.

Again, I would hope my colleagues would vote "no" on the rule and vote "no" on the bill if we are presented with it.

I would just say one final thing to my friend from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN), who I have a great deal of respect for: The deal is that Mr. Trump is the first nominee, I think, that I can recall, who has not released his taxes. Secretary Clinton has released years and years and years of her taxes. We know more about Secretary Clinton than we know about any other nominee, I think, in history.

I have always kind of wondered why Mr. Trump says some of the things he says, which, quite frankly, I sometimes find unbelievable, some of the comments on foreign policy. But when you look at his financial interests and his investments in these various countries, you can kind of understand why he defends dictators, why he never mentions the words "human rights," why he says some of the things he says about urging other countries to become nuclear powers when we should all be talking about how we control nuclear weapons in this country.

□ 1315

If we are worried about transparency and you are worried about conflicts of interest, and if we are truly worried about corruption, now is the time, I would urge my friends on the other side of the aisle, to tell the nominee of your party to come clean. There are so many tangled webs in The Trump Organization, so many financial ties to things that, quite frankly, should give every one of us concern. I don't know what the problem is about a little sunshine.

Like I said in the beginning, if Secretary Clinton did not release her tax returns, there would be calls for hearings and resolutions and there would be Special Orders, and it would go on and on and on; yet, with regard to their

nominee, it is okay for him to withhold all this information from the American people. I think that is unfortunate.

So if we are talking about transparency here today and if we are worried about corruption and if we are worried about conflicts of interest, there is that old saying, "Physician, heal thyself." I would urge my Republican colleagues to hold their nominee, hold their standard-bearer to a higher standard when it comes to transparency.

Mr. Speaker, I urge defeat of the previous question, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind Members to refrain from engaging in personalities toward nominees for the Office of the President.

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

I appreciate you issuing that reminder. I don't particularly enjoy this time of year on the House floor because we do have important business that needs to occur here, and we often get off base.

I don't think this is the right time to talk about the FBI investigation into Secretary Clinton. I don't think this is the right time to talk about the pay to play investigation going on with the Clinton Foundation. I don't think this is the right time to talk about all of her employees who have been questioned about her behavior and are pleading the Fifth, one right after the other, and are refusing to answer those questions. I don't think this is the right place for that. This is the right place to talk about something that brings us together, which is the defeat of a corrupt Iranian regime.

Mr. Speaker, my friend from Massachusetts is absolutely right. There are many of us on this side of the aisle who do not like the agreement that the President made with the Iranians. In fact, there are many on that side of the aisle who do not like the agreement that the President made with the Iranians, and you need go no further than this debate today to understand why.

I will read again from the President's own veto statement of this bill. It says: "This bill's required public postings"—these are the public postings of the assets and the corrupt arrangements that are involved in these top high officials of the Iranian regime. "This bill's required public postings . . . may be perceived by Iran and likely our Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA) partners as an attempt to undermine the fulfillment of our commitments, in turn impacting the continued viability of this diplomatic arrangement that peacefully and verifiably prevents Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapon."

I will say it again, Mr. Speaker, the President's concern is that, by making information public to the American people and the Iranian people—and this information would be published in four languages so that it would be available

to the Iranian people as well—by making information public about the corrupt business dealings of Iranian leaders, we will be violating the agreement the President signed with Iran.

How could this Nation possibly have signed an agreement, Mr. Speaker, that trades away our opportunity to shine sunlight on corrupt practices? I don't believe that we have. But my friend from Massachusetts said, Mr. Speaker: It undermines the letter and the intent of the agreement. To shine sunlight on corrupt practices.

Mr. Speaker, this is why the American people were concerned about the Iranian agreement. This is why we continue to be concerned about the Iranian agreement; but more importantly, this bill is not about that agreement.

The chairman of the Committee on Financial Services testified in front of the Committee on Rules last night, Mr. Speaker, and he said he just can't imagine why it is controversial for us to publish a list of officials and their holdings online. I agree.

It is baffling to me that the disclosure of what is, in many cases, publicly known information but that has not been compiled in a particular place could be a threat to preventing Iran from developing nuclear weapons. In fact, I would argue shining sunlight on the corrupt regime will empower the Iranian citizens to perhaps help us in this cause.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a controversial piece of legislation. This is, in fact, a transparency piece of legislation. The motion to recommit that the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON) discussed, candidly, most of what he said I agree with. I don't believe a motion to recommit is the right place to do it. He was not in front of the Committee on Rules last night. The bill he offers as a bipartisan, common-sense compromise has absolutely no Republicans on it whatsoever; but I do believe that pushing out our borders, pushing out our vetting process is exactly the right idea for this country. This happens to be a bill from the Committee on Financial Services. The gentleman from Mississippi happens to be the ranking member on the Committee on Homeland Security. I hope the Committee on Homeland Security will get about that business. I support it 100 percent.

But what I ask of my colleagues here today, Mr. Speaker, is to support this rule so we can debate this bill. Folks on both sides of the aisle like it, don't like it. Debating the bill is the right place to expose it. Transparency is good for the Iranians, and it is good for us as well. If we support this rule, we will also consider every amendment that was offered in the Committee on Rules. Every alternative idea, every perfecting idea, every improvement that this body came up with and brought to the Committee on Rules last night, Mr. Speaker, we are going

to make in order for debate here on the floor.

This is a tough time of year. Politics don't often bring out the best of policy, but we have got a good shot at it today. We have got a good shot at it with this rule. We have a rule here that I think everybody can be proud to vote for; and, as my friend from Tennessee said earlier, then we will debate the merits of the underlying bill and have the House work its will.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 876 OFFERED BY
MR. MCGOVERN

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

SEC. 2. 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. 5256) to enhance the overseas operations of the Department of Homeland Security aimed at preventing terrorist threats from reaching the United States, 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 Homeland Security. 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. 3. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 5256.

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 of-

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair once again will remind Members to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the nominees for the Office of the President.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3438, REQUIRE EVALUATION BEFORE IMPLEMENTING EXECUTIVE WISHLISTS ACT OF 2016; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5719, EMPOWERING EMPLOYEES THROUGH STOCK OWNERSHIP ACT; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 875 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 875

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. 3438) to amend title 5, United States Code, to postpone the effective date of high-impact rules pending judicial review. 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 the Judiciary. 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 the Judiciary 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 the bill (H.R. 5719) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the tax treatment of certain equity grants. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as

amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 3. It shall be in order at any time on the legislative day of September 22, 2016, or September 23, 2016, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules as though under clause 1 of rule XV. The Speaker or his designee shall consult with the Minority Leader or her designee on the designation of any matter for consideration pursuant to this section.

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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), 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. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous materials on House Resolution 875, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring this rule forward on behalf of the Committee on Rules. The rule provides for consideration of H.R. 3438, the Require Evaluation Before Implementing Executive Wishlists Act, or the REVIEW Act, and H.R. 5719, the Empowering Employees Through Stock Ownership Act.

For H.R. 3438, the rule provides 1 hour of debate, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking member of the Committee on the Judiciary, and also provides for a motion to recommit. The rule also provides 1 hour of debate, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means, for H.R. 5719 and provides a motion, also, to recommit.

The rule makes in order two amendments to H.R. 3438, representing ideas from my colleagues across the aisle. Yesterday the Committee on Rules received testimony from the chairman and ranking member on the Subcommittee on Regulatory Reform, Commercial and Antitrust Law of the Committee on the Judiciary, as well as testimony from Congressman ERIK PAULSEN and Congressman JOE CROWLEY from the Committee on Ways and Means.

The REVIEW Act, introduced by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr.

MARINO), went through regular order and enjoyed a thorough discussion at both the subcommittee and full committee level. In November of 2015, the Subcommittee on Regulatory Reform, Commercial and Antitrust Law, of which I am a member, held a legislative hearing on the bill. The bill was marked up by the Committee on the Judiciary on September 8, 2016. Several amendments were considered.

The Empowering Employees Through Stock Ownership Act also went through regular order. It was passed by voice vote through the Committee on Ways and Means on September 14. This bill, which has bipartisan support, would promote employee ownership at startup companies by addressing the tax treatment of restricted stock issued to employees.

Both bills represent good governance and provide relief for American workers and companies. The REVIEW Act is supported by numerous organizations, including the Chamber of Commerce, the Associated Builders and Contractors, Forestry Resource Association, the National Black Chamber of Commerce, the National Cattlemen's Beef Association, and dozens more.

□ 1330

I am a proud cosponsor of this legislation because it ensures that American businesses won't have to waste billions of dollars if legally flawed new rules are thrown out by the courts. The bill is just plain common sense.

This legislation came about in response to a very real problem. In Michigan v. EPA, the court held that the EPA's Utility MACT rule was legally infirm because the EPA decided costs were irrelevant to its decision to promulgate the rule. Costs of implementing the rule were estimated to cost \$9.6 billion per year, with the intended goal of achieving benefits of only \$4 million to \$6 million per year.

Let me repeat that, Mr. Speaker. Costs of implementing the rule were estimated to cost \$9.6 billion per year, with the intended goal of achieving benefits of only \$4 million to \$6 million per year.

It seems that something like this would not be true. Unfortunately, it is. The EPA issued a rule estimated to cost more than \$9 billion per year, even though the rule was expected to achieve benefits in airborne mercury emissions of \$4 million to \$6 million per year. The rule costs more than 10 times to implement than it brought in benefits.

Even away from the government perspective, there were questions concerning the actual other benefits as well. You wonder why people are angry at the Federal Government. Rules like this are a good example. Even worse, while the court found the rule legally infirm, it failed to set aside the rule which required businesses to continue to incur compliance costs, pending remand to the court of appeals.

This rule was not stayed by the courts during a multiyear legal battle

to challenge the rule, meaning the whole time the courts were deliberating, businesses were forced to start implementing the rule and bear the costs. This is a huge blow to businesses that had to pour time and money into compliance only to later be told it was a wasted effort because the legal challenge to the rule was ultimately successful.

To be sure, the successful legal challenge was a victory, but businesses shouldn't have had to go through years of uncertainty and billions of wasted dollars while the challenge was pending in the courts.

The REVIEW Act makes sense. It prevents needless expenditures like the ones businesses were forced to make while the Utility MACT case was winding its way through the courts.

You see, the fix is simple. The REVIEW Act requires that, when agencies promulgate new rules, the rules won't become legally effective until after the conclusion of litigation challenging them if the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs determines the rules would impose \$1 billion or more in costs to the economy. Litigants would have up to 60 days after the rule was published to bring litigation, unless specified otherwise by the particular law the agency rule pertains to.

Let me be very clear, Mr. Speaker. We aren't talking about this kind of change for every rule. We are not talking about this kind of change even for every major rule. We are talking about making this commonsense amendment for rules that cost over \$1 billion to the economy.

Businesses shouldn't be forced to deal with these enormous compliance costs while it is unclear if the rule will ever even actually come to fruition. The time and money businesses are currently forced to spend complying with these rules is time and money taken away from building the businesses, investing in the community, and creating jobs.

Now, I will admit these billion-dollar rules have been issued by administrations of both parties in recent years. That is another reason why Members on both sides of the aisle should support this legislation.

According to the American Action Forum, in fact, from 2006 to 2008, the Nation averaged two of these rules annually; and from 2009 to present, the figure has actually increased to roughly three times per year. This increase in billion-dollar rules should be troubling to all of us, and businesses run by Republicans and Democrats are suffering from the effects of complying with these rules even as litigation is ongoing. Under this administration alone, these billion-dollar rules are estimated to have imposed total annual costs of \$65.1 billion. According to the American Action Forum, the related paperwork burden comes out to be about 19.5 million hours.

Since 2005, there have been at least 34 billion-dollar rules, with 24 of those

promulgated under the current administration. Thirty-four may not seem like a large number over the last 11 years, but we have to remember the extremely high cost of these results and the impact those costs can have on businesses and the economy.

There may be arguments from those on the other side that affected parties could receive a stay from the court during litigation, but stays are hard to obtain and the consequences of not obtaining one can be very costly.

During a Judiciary Committee hearing on the REVIEW Act, Paul Noe of the American Forest and Paper Association provided an enlightening example of the consequences of courts failing to issue stays as the billion-dollar rule goes forward.

He said in his testimony: "In 2007, about \$2 million in compliance investments were stranded in the paper and wood products industry when a court struck down the 2004 Boiler MACT rule just 3 months before the compliance deadline. When the rules were reissued in 2013, the new standards had changed significantly, and previous investments proved to be the wrong approaches to achieve compliance. Wasting limited capital undermines the competitiveness of U.S. businesses and impedes growth and job creation."

Mr. Noe's example is another real-life circumstance of the reason this bill, the REVIEW Act, is necessary. The last thing we should be doing is impeding growth and job creation. Instead, we should be looking to stimulate the economy and getting Americans working.

I know in northeast Georgia, many businesses are struggling due to the crushing costs of regulations. Many of these are small businesses that aren't able to employ attorneys and consultants to keep them up-to-date with the latest edicts from Washington. Instead, they are forced to spend time and resources figuring out how to deal with the onslaught of red tape; and that doesn't even take into account the massive burdens of these billion-dollar regulations.

Mr. Speaker, I want to be clear that not all regulation is bad. Regulations can help protect public health and safety and ensure needed worker protections; but regulation that does not make sense, regulation that has compliance costs that far exceed the benefits, simply doesn't make sense.

Importantly, in this bill, we aren't trying to prevent more regulation. We are simply saying that, for rules over a billion dollars, they shouldn't go into effect until litigation has concluded. That is common sense. Businesses shouldn't have to waste resources complying with a huge, new burden for something that might not ever even come into effect.

This is a narrowly written but important change to the Administrative Procedure Act that will prevent waste and, hopefully, encourage agencies to rethink issuing billion-dollar rules.

This is a bill that had plenty of hearing in the Judiciary Committee, both sides expressing their desires on these issues, and had full debate and markup.

Both the REVIEW Act and the Empowering Employees through Stock Ownership Act are smart changes to current law that deserve full and fair consideration before this House.

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

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

I want to thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

(Mr. MCGOVERN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, the House is scheduled to be in session for 7 days before yet another 6-week-long recess. Instead of addressing the most pressing issues facing our communities, we are on this floor with yet another Republican messaging bill to undermine the Federal rulemaking process.

With all that needs to be done, with all the crises we are facing, this is what they bring to the floor—a bill, by the way, that is not going anywhere. It is going nowhere. The President is going to send up a veto message. The Senate is not even going to take it up.

So what we are spending our time doing, what we are spinning our wheels about right now is something that, basically, I guess my friends can use in a press release, but this is not real legislating. And I get it. Attacking Federal regulations has become a favorite sound bite for my friends on the other side of the aisle. They are always quick to remind us of the costs associated with these regulations, but completely dismiss the very real and typically much larger benefits of protecting consumers, the environment, public health, and safety.

I am against duplicative regulation. I am against warrantless regulation or needless regulation. It would be nice if we could actually function in a bipartisan way to identify where we have common ground and where there is agreement so that we can make some progress, but that is not the MO of the Republican leadership in this House. It is their way or the highway.

H.R. 3438 automatically freezes any covered rule when any lawsuit is filed, regardless of how frivolous that lawsuit may be, instead of relying on the discretion and expertise of the courts.

Now, let's be honest with ourselves, Mr. Speaker. This isn't about good governance and it isn't about ensuring high-impact regulations pass legal muster. This is yet another election year giveaway to Republican special interests, and it is that time of year—lots of fundraisers, lots of political activity. People go home and say they voted for this bill that is going nowhere. Therefore, vote for them.

This is just yet another Republican effort to indefinitely delay regulations

that they don't like—regulations that protect consumers, regulations that protect public health and that protect our environment.

In fact, one of the most troubling aspects of this bill is that it fails to include any exceptions for rules responding to public health emergencies.

Can you believe that?

I am disappointed that the Republicans in the Judiciary Committee rejected Democratic amendments to the bill that would have ensured lawsuits could not tie up responses to public health emergencies.

Why would anybody be against that?

This is especially troubling as we face major health crises, like the Zika virus, and rely on our government to protect our public health. We should be doing everything in our power to find a solution to this terrible emergency, not passing legislation that can make finding that solution even harder.

I strongly oppose this misguided and unnecessary legislation, which does nothing to promote an efficient regulatory process, but delays regulations needed to protect our public health and safety.

This week the House is also set to consider H.R. 5719, the Empowering Employees through Stock Ownership Act. By allowing rank-and-file employees of private companies to defer payments on their stock options for 7 years, this bill makes it easier for these employees—often lower-income earners—to receive equity as part of their compensation.

Our economy is recovering, but not for everyone. More and more wealth is becoming concentrated in the top 1 percent and income inequality is at its highest levels since the Great Depression. Meanwhile, working families struggle to make ends meet, often needing several jobs just to get by.

So I support efforts to allow rank-and-file employees to truly share in the long-term success of their companies and our greater innovation economy. I think the majority of us share in that belief. But I do share the concerns that have been expressed by my Democratic colleagues during the Ways and Means Committee markup and in the Rules Committee last night that this bill isn't paid for and adds \$1.03 billion to the deficit. This bill not being paid for adds over a billion dollars to our deficit.

The Republican leadership in this House routinely refuses to bring up funding legislation that adequately addresses public health crises. They demand offsets anytime there is an emergency. When it comes to increases in our social safety net, we can't do it because we have to find offsets. But when it comes to tax breaks, there are no limits. They don't require offsets.

Just last week this House passed an unpaid-for tax cut that, if enacted, would add almost \$33 billion to the deficit. The Ways and Means Committee has marked up nearly \$54 billion worth of unpaid-for tax cuts just this year.

There was a time when caring about the deficit and the debt was something my Republican friends would talk about, but I guess that is no longer the case. So when my Republican friends talk about their commitment to fiscal responsibility, I have to ask: Why the double standard?

We can't help the people of Flint, Michigan, but we can pass tax breaks and tax cuts and not have to pay for them. By the way, the vast majority of tax cuts that my Republican friends support go to the wealthiest people in this country, not to the middle class.

We are told we have to fully offset emergency responses, as I said, to the water crisis in Flint, Michigan; the opioid epidemic; flooding disasters; and the growing threat of the Zika virus, but yet we don't have to pay for tax cuts. I just don't quite get it.

Last night, in the Rules Committee, my friends and colleagues, JOE CROWLEY and ANNA ESHOO, Democratic cosponsors of this bill, offered an amendment to offset the over \$1 billion cost by increasing a tax on oil barrels by two cents. That is just two cents that they would increase the cost. But what is important for people to remember is that what that means for the consumer is five one-thousandths of a penny on a gallon of gas.

□ 1345

So in order to offset something that we think is a good benefit, and to pay for it, it would cost consumers five one-thousandths of a penny on a gallon of gas. Most people that I talk to I don't believe think that that is an unreasonable thing, the choice between adding to the deficit, which, by the way, we all pay for anyway, or basically paying for things as we go. And so five one-thousandths of a penny on a gallon of gas, in order to offset the cost of this bill, I don't think, is unreasonable.

Now, this amendment was not made in order for consideration on the House floor because my Republican colleagues insisted that the offset was not germane to the bill.

But the House Rules Committee has the power to waive germaneness and other rules, and frequently does so, when it suits the needs of the majority. And during this Congress alone, Republicans on the Rules Committee have granted 245 waivers; 242, or 98 percent of them, have been for Republican initiatives. So they do it all the time when they want to.

So, Mr. Speaker, we had the ability to move the Crowley-Eshoo amendment to the floor for consideration, but Republicans in the Rules Committee blocked our efforts to responsibly pay for the costs associated with this change in tax law.

Now, I appreciate the work of my colleagues in promoting employee ownership among all of a company's workers, not just those at the top. But I do have some serious concerns about this majority's insistence that emergency re-

lief and other priorities be offset while tax cuts are able to sail through this House without a second thought and not be paid for. That is the wrong approach.

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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would just like to make one comment, and then I think my friend from Massachusetts and I can look around. Nobody is beating our door down for time here.

There are no billion-dollar public health issues that were brought up that this—it doesn't waive for a billion-dollar public health emergency. In fact, probably if we did have over-a-billion-dollar health emergency, we could handle it better through statutory change than through a regulatory agency doing this. So it is an argument, but it is not a valid argument, I believe, in this case.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I am going to urge my colleagues to vote to defeat the previous question, vote "no" on the previous question. And if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up the bipartisan no fly, no buy legislation that would allow the Attorney General to bar the sale of firearms and explosives to those on the FBI's terrorist watch list.

Mr. Speaker, the time to act is now. There have been more than 10,000 gun-related deaths in this country this year alone. The country cannot tolerate the indifference on this issue any longer.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, as I said at the beginning of my remarks, we have only a few days left here before there is another recess, and we have incredible challenges before us. We have an opioid crisis in this country. We passed legislation that said all the right things, but the funding to fund all those nice things wasn't following.

We are confronted with a Zika virus crisis, and the American people are expecting us to do something, and this House has been twiddling its thumbs for far too long. The time for action is now.

We have a water crisis in Flint, Michigan; can't seem to get anything done in this House. Yet, those poor people can't drink the water out of their faucets and have been poisoned for years as a result of the indifference on that situation.

On the issue of gun violence, I mean, every day somebody gets killed in gun violence. We have tried to bring up a bill that would require universal background checks. I don't care what your position on guns is, I think we all should be able to agree that there ought to be universal background checks.

Right now, if you go into a licensed gun dealer, you have to go through a background check. But you get around that if you go to a gun show or buy a gun online.

I think everybody, I don't care what your philosophy is, should want to keep guns out of the hands of violent criminals and people who are dangerously mentally ill. I don't know why that is such a controversy in this House of Representatives. Yet, we can't even get the leadership to allow us to bring that bill to the floor.

On the issue that the previous question is about, which is the no fly, no buy list, I don't think there is anybody in this country who can understand why we think it is okay to, on one hand, say to somebody who is on an FBI terrorist watch list: we are concerned about you so much that you can't fly on an airplane. But, at the same time, say: well, okay, but you can go out and buy a gun; you can buy an assault weapon; and you can go out and buy a weapon of war.

That doesn't make any sense. People can't quite get why we can't come together on that. But even if you don't want to vote for that, you ought to let us have that debate and that vote.

These are the kinds of issues that we should be talking about. Yet, we are doing message bills that are going nowhere, again, not just because the President wants to veto them, it is because the Senate won't even take some of these things up.

So in these few days we have left, let's do something radical. Let's actually do the people's business. Let's do something that is going to help people in this country and improve their quality of life and protect them.

Mr. Speaker, again, I urge a "no" vote on the previous question and a "no" vote on the rule.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I think we have made our case for the rule. I think it needs to be passed—also the underlying bills. I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the underlying bills.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 875 OFFERED BY
MR. MCGOVERN

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. 1076) to increase public safety by permitting the Attorney General to deny the transfer of a firearm or the issuance of firearms or explosives licenses to

a known or suspected dangerous terrorist. 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 the Judiciary. 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. 1076.

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. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, 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. MCGOVERN. 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 on House Resolution 875 will be followed by 5-minute votes on adopting House Resolution 875, if ordered; ordering the previous question on House Resolution 876; adopting House Resolution 876, if ordered; and suspending the rules and passing the following bills: H.R. 3957, H.R. 5659, H.R. 5713, and H.R. 5613.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 237, nays 171, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 524]

YEAS—237

Abraham	Clawson (FL)	Fleming
Aderholt	Coffman	Flores
Allen	Cole	Forbes
Amash	Collins (GA)	Fortenberry
Amodei	Collins (NY)	Fox
Babin	Comstock	Franks (AZ)
Barletta	Conaway	Frelinghuysen
Barr	Cook	Garrett
Barton	Costello (PA)	Gibbs
Benishek	Cramer	Gibson
Bilirakis	Crawford	Gohmert
Bishop (MI)	Crenshaw	Goodlatte
Black	Culberson	Gosar
Blackburn	Curbelo (FL)	Gowdy
Blum	Davidson	Granger
Bost	Davis, Rodney	Graves (GA)
Boustany	Denham	Graves (LA)
Brady (TX)	DeSantis	Graves (MO)
Brat	DesJarlais	Griffith
Bridenstine	Diaz-Balart	Grothman
Brooks (AL)	Dold	Guinta
Buchanan	Donovan	Guthrie
Buck	Duffy	Hanna
Bucshon	Duncan (SC)	Hardy
Burgess	Duncan (TN)	Harper
Byrne	Ellmers (NC)	Harris
Calvert	Emmer (MN)	Hartzler
Carter (GA)	Farenthold	Heck (NV)
Carter (TX)	Fincher	Hensarling
Chabot	Fitzpatrick	Herrera Beutler
Chaffetz	Fleischmann	Hice, Jody B.

Hill	McSally	Salmon	Schiff	Swalwell (CA)	Vela	Guinta	McCarthy	Ross
Holding	Meadows	Sanford	Scott (VA)	Takano	Velázquez	Guthrie	McCaul	Rothfus
Hudson	Messer	Scalise	Scott, David	Thompson (CA)	Visclosky	Hanna	McClintock	Rouzer
Huelskamp	Mica	Schweikert	Serrano	Thompson (MS)	Walz	Hardy	McHenry	Royce
Huizenga (MI)	Miller (FL)	Scott, Austin	Sewell (AL)	Titus	Wasserman	Harper	McKinley	Russell
Hultgren	Miller (MI)	Sensenbrenner	Sherman	Tonko	Schultz	Harris	McMorris	Salmon
Hunter	Moolenaar	Sessions	Sinema	Torres	Waters, Maxine	Hartzler	Rodgers	Sanford
Hurd (TX)	Mooney (WV)	Shimkus	Sires	Tsongas	Watson Coleman	Heck (NV)	McSally	Scalise
Hurt (VA)	Mullin	Shuster	Slaughter	Van Hollen	Welch	Hensarling	Meadows	Schweikert
Issa	Mulvaney	Simpson	Smith (WA)	Vargas	Wilson (FL)	Herrera Beutler	Meehan	Scott, Austin
Jenkins (KS)	Murphy (PA)	Smith (MO)	Speier	Veasey	Yarmuth	Hice, Jody B.	Messer	Sensenbrenner
Jenkins (WV)	Newhouse	Smith (NE)				Holding	Mica	Sessions
Johnson (OH)	Noem	Smith (NJ)				Hudson	Miller (FL)	Shimkus
Johnson, Sam	Nugent	Smith (TX)				Huelskamp	Miller (MI)	Shuster
Jolly	Nunes	Stefanik	Bishop (UT)	Grijalva	Poe (TX)	Huizenga (MI)	Moolenaar	Simpson
Jones	Olson	Stewart	Brooks (IN)	Higgins	Rush	Jordan	Mooney (WV)	Sinema
Jordan	Palazzo	Marchant	Capuano	Larson (CT)	Sánchez, Linda	Joyce	Mullin	Smith (MO)
Joyce	Palmer	Stivers	Clarke (NY)	Marchant	T.	Katko	Mulvaney	Smith (NE)
Katko	Paulsen	Stutzman	Dent	Meehan	Sanchez, Loretta	Kelly (MS)	Hurd (TX)	Smith (NJ)
Kelly (MS)	Pearce	Thompson (PA)	Deutch	Moore	Schrader	Kelly (PA)	Hurt (VA)	Smith (TX)
Kelly (PA)	Perry	Thornberry	Farr	Neugebauer	Tiberi	King (IA)	Issa	Stefanik
King (IA)	Peterson	Tipton	Garamendi	Perlmutter	Walters, Mimi	King (NY)	Jenkins (KS)	Stewart
King (NY)	Pittenger	Trott				Kinzinger (IL)	Jenkins (WV)	Nugent
Kinzinger (IL)	Pitts	Turner				Kline	Johnson (OH)	Nunes
Kline	Poliquin	Upton				Knigh	Johnson, Sam	Olson
Knight	Pompeo	Valadao				Labrador	Jolly	Palazzo
Labrador	Posey	Wagner				LaHood	Jones	Palmer
LaHood	Price, Tom	Walberg				LaMalfa	Jordan	Paulsen
LaMalfa	Ratcliffe	Walden				Lamborn	Joyce	Pearce
Lamborn	Reed	Walker				Lance	Katko	Perry
Lance	Reichert	Walorski				Latta	Kelly (MS)	Pittenger
Latta	Renacci	Weber (TX)				LoBiondo	King (IA)	Pitts
LoBiondo	Ribble	Webster (FL)				Long	King (NY)	Poliquin
Long	Rice (SC)	Wenstrup				Loudermilk	Kinzinger (IL)	Pompeo
Loudermilk	Rigell	Westerman				Love	Kline	Posey
Love	Roby	Westmoreland				Lucas	Knigh	Price, Tom
Lucas	Roe (TN)	Williams				Luetkemeyer	Labrador	Ratcliffe
Luetkemeyer	Rogers (AL)	Wilson (SC)				Lummis	LaHood	Reed
Lummis	Rogers (KY)	Wittman				Marino	LaMalfa	Reichert
MacArthur	Rohrabacher	Womack				Massie	Lamborn	Renacci
Marino	Rokita	Woodall				McCarthy	Lance	Ribble
McCaul	Rooney (FL)	Yoder				McCaul	Latta	Rice (SC)
McClintock	Ros-Lehtinen	Yoho				McCaul	LoBiondo	Rigell
McClintock	Roskam	Young (AK)				McCaul	Long	Roby
McHenry	Ross	Young (IA)				McCaul	Loudermilk	Roe (TN)
McKinley	Rothfus	Young (IN)				McCaul	Love	Rogers (AL)
McMorris	Rouzer	Zeldin				McCaul	Lucas	Rogers (KY)
Rodgers	Royce	Zinke				McCaul	Luetkemeyer	Rohrabacher
	Russell					McCaul	Lummis	Rokita
						McCaul	MacArthur	Rooney (FL)
						McCaul	Marchant	Ros-Lehtinen
						McCaul	Marino	Roskam

NOT VOTING—23

□ 1413

Mses. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, GRAHAM, Mr. CONNOLLY, and Ms. BONAMICI changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for: Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 524, I was at an Ethics Committee hearing. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 524, I was unavoidably detained at an Ethics Committee meeting. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

Stated against: Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted rollcall No. 524, “nay.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FORTENBERRY). 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. MCGOVERN. 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 239, noes 181, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 525]

AYES—239

Adams	Dingell	Lieu, Ted	Abraham	Carter (GA)	Duncan (SC)	Adams	DeFazio	Kelly (IL)
Aguilar	Doggett	Lipinski	Aderholt	Carter (TX)	Duncan (TN)	Aguilar	DeGette	Kennedy
Ashford	Doyle, Michael	Loebsack	Allen	Chabot	Ellmers (NC)	Amash	Delaney	Kildee
Bass	F.	Lofgren	Amodei	Chaffetz	Emmer (MN)	Amash	DeLauro	Kilmer
Beatty	Duckworth	Lowenthal	Babin	Clawson (FL)	Farenthold	Bass	DelBene	Kind
Becerra	Edwards	Lowey	Barr	Coffman	Fincher	Beatty	DeSaulnier	Kirkpatrick
Bera	Ellison	Lujan Grisham (NM)	Barton	Cole	Fitzpatrick	Becerra	Deutch	Kuster
Beyer	Engel	Luján, Ben Ray (NM)	Benishkeh	Collins (GA)	Fleischmann	Bera	Dingell	Langevin
Bishop (GA)	Eshoo	Lynch	Bilirakis	Collins (NY)	Fleming	Beyer	Doggett	Larsen (WA)
Blumenauer	Eshoo	Maloney, Carolyn	Bishop (MI)	Comstock	Flores	Bishop (GA)	Doyle, Michael	Larson (CT)
Bonamici	Esty	Maloney, Sean	Bishop (UT)	Conaway	Forbes	Blumenauer	F.	Lawrence
Bonamici	Foster	McNerney	Black	Cook	Fortenberry	Bonamici	Duckworth	Lee
Boyle, Brendan	Frankel (FL)	Meeks	Blackburn	Costello (PA)	Fox	Boyle, Brendan	Edwards	Levin
F.	Fudge	Meng	Blum	Cramer	Franks (AZ)	F.	Ellison	Lewis
Brady (PA)	Gabbard	Moulton	Bost	Crawford	Frelinghuysen	Brady (PA)	Engel	Lieu, Ted
Brown (FL)	Gallo	Murphy (FL)	Boustany	Crenshaw	Garrett	Brown (FL)	Eshoo	Lipinski
Brownley (CA)	Graham	Napolitano	Brady (TX)	Curbelo (FL)	Gibbs	Brownley (CA)	Eshoo	Loebsack
Bustos	Grayson	Neal	Brat	Davidson	Gibson	Bustos	Farr	Lofgren
Butterfield	Green, Al	Nolan	Bridenstine	Davis, Rodney	Gohmert	Butterfield	Foster	Lowenthal
Capps	Green, Gene	Norcross	Brooks (AL)	Denham	Goodlatte	Capps	Frankel (FL)	Lowey
Cárdenas	Gutiérrez	O'Rourke	Brooks (IN)	Dent	Gosar	Capuano	Fudge	Lujan Grisham (NM)
Carney	Hahn	Pallone	Buchanan	DeSantis	Gowdy	Cárdenas	Gabbard	Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Carson (IN)	Hastings	Pascarell	Bucshon	DesJarlais	Granger	Carney	Gallo	Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Cartwright	Heck (WA)	Payne	Burgess	Diaz-Balart	Graves (GA)	Carson (IN)	Garamendi	Maloney, Sean
Castor (FL)	Himes	Pelosi	Byrne	Dold	Graves (LA)	Cartwright	Graham	Maloney, Carolyn
Castro (TX)	Hinojosa	Peters	Calvert	Donovan	Graves (MO)	Castor (FL)	Grayson	Maloney, Sean
Chu, Judy	Honda	Pingree		Duffy	Griffith	Castro (TX)	Green, Al	Maloney, Sean
Cicilline	Hoyer	Pocan			Grothman	Chu, Judy	Green, Gene	Massie
Clark (MA)	Huffman	Polis				Cicilline	Gutiérrez	Matsui
Clay	Israel	Price (NC)				Clark (MA)	Hahn	McCollum
Cleaver	Jackson Lee	Quigley				Clarke (NY)	Hastings	McDermott
Clyburn	Jeffries	Rangel				Clay	Heck (WA)	McGovern
Cohen	Johnson (GA)	Rice (NY)				Cleaver	Higgins	McNerney
Connolly	Johnson, E. B.	Roybal-Allard				Clyburn	Himes	Meeks
Conyers	Kaptur	Ruiz				Cohen	Hinojosa	Meng
Cooper	Keating	Ruppersberger				Connolly	Honda	Moulton
Costa	Kelly (IL)	Sarbanes				Conyers	Hoyer	Murphy (FL)
Courtney	Kennedy	Schakowsky				Cooper	Huffman	Nadler
Crowley	Kildee					Costa	Israel	Napolitano
Cuellar	Kilmer					Courtney	Jackson Lee	Neal
Cummins	Kind					Crowley	Jeffries	Nolan
Davis (CA)	Kirkpatrick					Cuellar	Johnson (GA)	Norcross
Davis, Danny	Kuster					Cummins	Johnson, E. B.	O'Rourke
DeFazio	Langevin					Davis (CA)	Kaptur	Pallone
DeGette	Larsen (WA)					Davis, Danny	Keating	Pascarell
Delaney	Lawrence							
DeLauro	Lee							
DelBene	Levin							
DeSaulnier	Lewis							

NOES—181

Adams	DeFazio	Kelly (IL)
Aguilar	DeGette	Kennedy
Amash	Delaney	Kildee
Ashford	DeLauro	Kilmer
Bass	DelBene	Kind
Beatty	DeSaulnier	Kirkpatrick
Becerra	Deutch	Kuster
Bera	Dingell	Langevin
Beyer	Doggett	Larsen (WA)
Bishop (GA)	Doyle, Michael	Larson (CT)
Blumenauer	F.	Lawrence
Bonamici	Duckworth	Lee
Boyle, Brendan	Edwards	Levin
F.	Ellison	Lewis
Brady (PA)	Engel	Lieu, Ted
Brown (FL)	Eshoo	Lipinski
Brownley (CA)	Esty	Loebsack
Bustos	Farr	Lofgren
Butterfield	Foster	Lowenthal
Capps	Frankel (FL)	Lowey
Capuano	Fudge	Lujan Grisham (NM)
Cárdenas	Gabbard	Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Carney	Gallo	Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Carson (IN)	Garamendi	Maloney, Sean
Cartwright	Graham	Maloney, Carolyn
Castor (FL)	Grayson	Maloney, Sean
Castro (TX)	Green, Al	Maloney, Sean
Chu, Judy	Green, Gene	Massie
Cicilline	Gutiérrez	Matsui
Clark (MA)	Hahn	McCollum
Clay	Hastings	McDermott
Cleaver	Heck (WA)	McGovern
Clyburn	Higgins	McNerney
Cohen	Himes	Meeks
Connolly	Hinojosa	Meng
Conyers	Honda	Moulton
Cooper	Hoyer	Murphy (FL)
Costa	Huffman	Nadler
Courtney	Israel	Napolitano
Crowley	Jackson Lee	Neal
Cuellar	Jeffries	Nolan
Cummins	Johnson (GA)	Norcross
Davis (CA)	Johnson, E. B.	O'Rourke
Davis, Danny	Kaptur	Pallone
	Keating	Pascarell

Payne Sánchez, Linda Titus
 Pelosi T. Tonko
 Perlmutter Sarbanes Torres
 Peters Schakowsky Tsongas
 Peterson Schiff Van Hollen
 Pingree Scott (VA) Vargas
 Pocan Scott, David Veasey
 Polis Serrano Vela
 Price (NC) Sewell (AL) Velázquez
 Quigley Sherman Visclosky
 Rangel Sires Walz
 Rice (NY) Slaughter Wasserman
 Richmond Smith (WA) Schultz
 Roybal-Allard Speier Waters, Maxine
 Ruiz Swalwell (CA) Watson Coleman
 Ruppertsberger Takano Welch
 Ryan (OH) Thompson (CA) Wilson (FL)
 Thompson (MS) Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—11

Grijalva Poe (TX) Tiberi
 Hill Rush Walters, Mimi
 Lynch Sanchez, Loretta Westmoreland
 Moore Schrader

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
 The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1420

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 for:
 Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 525, had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5461, IRANIAN LEADERSHIP ASSET TRANSPARENCY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 876) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5461) to require the Secretary of the Treasury to submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees on the estimated total assets under direct or indirect control by certain senior Iranian leaders and other figures, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 242, nays 181, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 526]

YEAS—242

Abraham Boustany Coffman
 Aderholt Brady (TX) Cole
 Allen Brat Collins (GA)
 Amash Bridenstine Collins (NY)
 Amodei Brooks (AL) Comstock
 Babin Brooks (IN) Conaway
 Barletta Buchanan Cook
 Barr Buck Costello (PA)
 Barton Bucshon Cramer
 Benishek Burgess Crawford
 Bilirakis Byrne Crenshaw
 Bishop (MI) Calvert Culberson
 Bishop (UT) Carter (GA) Curbelo (FL)
 Black Carter (TX) Davidson
 Blackburn Chabot Davis, Rodney
 Blum Chaffetz Denham
 Bost Clawson (FL) Dent

DeSantis Kelly (MS) Ribble
 DesJarlais Kelly (PA) Rice (SC)
 Diaz-Balart King (IA) Rigell
 Dold King (NY) Roby
 Donovan Kinzinger (IL) Roe (TN)
 Duffy Kline Rogers (AL)
 Duncan (SC) Knight Rogers (KY)
 Duncan (TN) Labrador Rohrabacher
 Ellmers (NC) LaHood Rokita
 Emmer (MN) LaMalfa Rooney (FL)
 Farenthold Lamborn Ros-Lehtinen
 Fincher Lance Roskam
 Fitzpatrick Latta Ross
 Fleischmann LoBiondo Rothfus
 Fleming Long Rouzer
 Flores Loudermilk Royce
 Forbes Love Russell
 Fortenberry Lucas Salmon
 Franks (AZ) Luettkemeyer Sanford
 Frelinghuysen Lummis Scalise
 Garrett MacArthur Schweikert
 Gibbs Marchant Scott, Austin
 Gibson Marino Sensenbrenner
 Gohmert Massie Sessions
 Goodlatte McCaul Shimkus
 Gosar McClintock Shuster
 Gowdy McHenry Simpson
 Granger McKinley Smith (MO)
 Graves (GA) McMorris Smith (NE)
 Graves (LA) Rodgers Smith (NJ)
 Graves (MO) Smith (TX) Stefanik
 Griffith Meadows Stewart
 Grothman Meehan Stivers
 Guinta Messer Stutzman
 Guthrie Mica Thompson (PA)
 Hanna Miller (FL) Thornberry
 Hardy Miller (MI) Tipton
 Harper Moolenaar Trott
 Harris Mooney (WV) Turner
 Hartzler Mullin Upton
 Heck (NV) Mulvaney Valadao
 Hensarling Murphy (PA) Wagner
 Herrera Beutler Neugebauer
 Hice, Jody B. Newhouse
 Hill Noem
 Holding Nugent
 Hudson Nunes
 Huelskamp Olson
 Huizenga (MI) Palazzo
 Hultgren Palmer
 Hunter Paulsen
 Hurd (TX) Pearce
 Hurt (VA) Perry
 Issa Pittenger
 Jenkins (KS) Pitts
 Jenkins (WV) Poliquin
 Johnson (OH) Pompeo
 Johnson, Sam Posey
 Jolly Price, Tom
 Jones Ratcliffe
 Jordan Reed
 Joyce Reichert
 Katko Renacci

NAYS—181

Adams Cohen Gallego
 Aguilar Connolly Garamendi
 Ashford Conyers Graham
 Bass Cooper Grayson
 Beatty Green, Al
 Becerra Courtney Green, Gene
 Bera Crowley Gutiérrez
 Beyer Cuellar Hahn
 Bishop (GA) Cummings Hastings
 Blumenauer Davis (CA) Heck (WA)
 Bonamici Davis, Danny Higgins
 Boyle, Brendan DeFazio Himes
 F. DeGette Hinojosa
 Brady (PA) Delaney Honda
 Brown (FL) DeLauro Hoyer
 Brownley (CA) DeBene Huffman
 Bustos DeSaulnier Israel
 Butterfield Deutch Jackson Lee
 Capps Dingell Jeffries
 Capuano Doggett Johnson (GA)
 Cárdenas Doyle, Michael Johnson, E. B.
 Carney F. Kaptur
 Carson (IN) Duckworth Keating
 Cartwright Edwards Kelly (IL)
 Castor (FL) Ellison Kennedy
 Castro (TX) Engel Kildee
 Chu, Judy Eshoo Kilmer
 Cicilline Esty Kind
 Clark (MA) Farr Kirkpatrick
 Clarke (NY) Foster Kuster
 Clay Frankel (FL) Langevin
 Cleaver Fudge Larsen (WA)
 Clyburn Gabbard Larson (CT)

Lawrence Nolan
 Lee Norcross
 Levin O'Rourke
 Lewis Pallone
 Lieu, Ted Pascarell
 Lipinski Payne
 Loeb sack Pelosi
 Lofgren Perlmutter
 Lowenthal Swallow (CA)
 Lowey Peters
 Lujan Grisham Peterson
 (NM) Pingree
 Luján, Ben Ray Pocan
 (NM) Polis
 Price (NC) Price (NC)
 Lynch Quigley
 Maloney Rangel
 Carolyn Rice (NY)
 Maloney, Sean Richmond
 Matsui Roybal-Allard
 McCollum Ruiz
 McDermott Ruppertsberger
 McGovern Ryan (OH)
 McNerney Sánchez, Linda
 Meeks T.
 Meng Sarbanes
 Moulton Schakowsky
 Murphy (FL) Schiff
 Nadler Scott (VA)
 Napolitano Scott, David
 Neal Serrano

NOT VOTING—8

Grijalva Rush Tiberi
 Moore Sanchez, Loretta Walters, Mimi
 Poe (TX) Schrader

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
 The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1426

So the previous question was ordered.
 The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.
 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. MCGOVERN. 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 247, noes 174, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 527]

AYES—247

Abraham Chaffetz Farenthold
 Aderholt Clawson (FL) Fincher
 Allen Coffman Pitzpatrick
 Amash Cole Fleischmann
 Amodei Amodei Collins (GA)
 Babin Collins (NY) Flores
 Barletta Comstock Forbes
 Barr Conaway Fortenberry
 Barton Cook Foy
 Benishek Costa Franks (AZ)
 Bilirakis Costello (PA) Frelinghuysen
 Bishop (MI) Cramer Garrett
 Bishop (UT) Crawford Gibbs
 Black Crenshaw Gibson
 Blackburn Culberson Gohmert
 Blum Curbelo (FL) Goodlatte
 Bost Davidson Gosar
 Boustany Davis, Rodney Gowdy
 Brat DeFazio Granger
 Bridenstine Denham Graves (GA)
 Brooks (AL) Dent Graves (LA)
 Brooks (IN) DeSantis Graves (MO)
 Barletta DesJarlais Griffith
 Barr Buck Diaz-Balart Grothman
 Barton Bucshon Dold Guinta
 Benishek Burgess Donovan Guthrie
 Bilirakis Calvert Duffy
 Bishop (MI) Carter (GA) Duncan (SC)
 Bishop (UT) Carter (TX) Duncan (TN)
 Black Chabot Ellmers (NC)
 Blackburn Chaffetz Emmer (MN)
 Blum Clawson (FL) Dent

Hastings	McHenry	Rouzer	Polis	Scott, David	Van Hollen	Davidson	Jenkins (WV)	Pallone
Heck (NV)	McKinley	Royce	Price (NC)	Serrano	Vargas	Davis (CA)	Johnson (GA)	Pascarell
Hensarling	McMorris	Russell	Quigley	Sewell (AL)	Veasey	Davis, Danny	Johnson (OH)	Paulsen
Herrera Beutler	Rodgers	Salmon	Rangel	Sherman	Vela	Davis, Rodney	Johnson, E. B.	Payne
Hice, Jody B.	McSally	Sanford	Rice (NY)	Sires	Velázquez	DeFazio	Johnson, Sam	Pearce
Hill	Meadows	Scalise	Richmond	Slaughter	Visclosky	DeGette	Jolly	Pelosi
Holding	Meehan	Schweikert	Roybal-Allard	Smith (WA)	Walz	Delaney	Jordan	Perlmutter
Hudson	Messer	Scott, Austin	Ruiz	Speier	Wasserman	DeLauro	Kaptur	Perry
Huelskamp	Mica	Sensenbrenner	Ruppersberger	Swalwell (CA)	Schultz	DelBene	Katko	Peters
Huizenga (MI)	Miller (FL)	Sessions	Ryan (OH)	Takano	Waters, Maxine	Denham	Keating	Peterson
Hultgren	Miller (MI)	Shimkus	Sánchez, Linda	Tompson (CA)	Watson Coleman	Dent	Kelly (IL)	Pingree
Hunter	Moolenaar	Shuster	T.	Tompson (MS)	Welch	DeSantis	Kelly (MS)	Pittenger
Hurd (TX)	Mooney (WV)	Simpson	Sarbanes	Titus	Wilson (FL)	DeSaulnier	Kelly (PA)	Pitts
Hurt (VA)	Mullin	Sinema	Schakowsky	Tonko	Yarmuth	DesJarlais	Kennedy	Pocan
Issa	Mulvaney	Smith (MO)	Schiff	Torres		Deutch	Kildee	Poliquin
Jenkins (KS)	Murphy (PA)	Smith (NE)	Scott (VA)	Tsongas		Diaz-Balart	Kilmer	Pompeo
Jenkins (WV)	Neugebauer	Smith (NJ)				Dingell	Kind	Posey
Johnson (OH)	Newhouse	Smith (TX)				Doggett	King (IA)	Price (NC)
Johnson, Sam	Noem	Stefanik	Brady (TX)	Poe (TX)	Tiberi	Dold	King (NY)	Price, Tom
Jolly	Nugent	Grijalva	Grijalva	Rush	Walters, Mimi	Donovan	Kinzinger (IL)	Quigley
Jones	Nunes	Johnson (GA)	Johnson (GA)	Sanchez, Loretta		Doyle, Michael	Kirkpatrick	Rangel
Jordan	Olson	Moore	Moore	Schrader		F.	Kline	Ratcliffe
Joyce	Palazzo					Duckworth	Knight	Reed
Katko	Palmer	Thornberry				Duffy	Kuster	Reichert
Kelly (IL)	Paulsen	Tipton				Duncan (TN)	LaHood	Renacci
Kelly (MS)	Payne	Trott				Edwards	LaMalfa	Rice (NY)
Kelly (PA)	Pearce	Turner				Ellison	Lamborn	Rice (SC)
King (IA)	Perry	Upton				Ellmers (NC)	Lance	Richmond
King (NY)	Pittenger	Valadao				Emmer (MN)	Langevin	Rigell
Kinzinger (IL)	Pitts	Wagner				Engel	Larsen (WA)	Roby
Kline	Poliquin	Walberg				Eshoo	Larson (CT)	Roe (TN)
Knight	Pompeo	Walden				Esty	Latta	Rogers (AL)
Labrador	Posey	Walker				Farenthold	Lawrence	Rogers (KY)
LaHood	Price, Tom	Walorski				Farr	Lee	Rohrabacher
LaMalfa	Ratcliffe	Weber (TX)				Fincher	Levin	Rooney (FL)
Lamborn	Reed	Webster (FL)				Fitzpatrick	Lewis	Ros-Lehtinen
Lance	Reichert	Wenstrup				Fleischmann	Lieu, Ted	Roskam
Latta	Renacci	Westerman				Fleming	Lipinski	Ross
LoBiondo	Ribble	Westmoreland				Flores	LoBiondo	Rothfus
Long	Rice (SC)	Williams				Forbes	Loeb sack	Rouzer
Loudermilk	Rigell	Wilson (SC)				Fortenberry	Lofgren	Roybal-Allard
Love	Roby	Wittman				Foster	Long	Royce
Lucas	Roe (TN)	Womack				Fox	Loudermilk	Ruiz
Luetkemeyer	Rogers (AL)	Woodall				Frankel (FL)	Love	Ruppersberger
Lummis	Rogers (KY)	Yoder				Franks (AZ)	Lowenthal	Russell
MacArthur	Rohrabacher	Yoho				Frelinghuysen	Lowe	Ryan (OH)
Marchant	Rokita	Young (AK)				Fudge	Lucas	Salmon
Marino	Rooney (FL)	Young (IA)				Gabbard	Luetkemeyer	Sánchez, Linda
Massie	Ros-Lehtinen	Young (IN)				Gallego	Lujan Grisham	T.
McCarthy	Roskam	Zeldin				Garamendi	(NM)	Sarbanes
McCaul	Ross	Zinke				Garrett	Luján, Ben Ray	Scalise
McClintock	Rothfus					Gibbs	(NM)	Schakowsky
						Gibson	Lynch	Schiff
						Gohmert	MacArthur	Schweikert
						Goodlatte	Maloney,	Scott (VA)
						Gowdy	Carolyn	Scott, Austin
						Graham	Maloney, Sean	Scott, David
						Granger	Marchant	Sensenbrenner
						Graves (GA)	Marino	Serrano
						Graves (LA)	Massie	Sessions
						Graves (MO)	Matsui	Sewell (AL)
						Grayson	McCarthy	Sherman
						Green, Al	McCaul	Shimkus
						Green, Gene	McClintock	Shuster
						Guinta	McCollum	Simpson
						Guthrie	McGovern	Sinema
						Gutiérrez	McHenry	Sires
						Hahn	McKinley	Slaughter
						Hanna	McMorris	Smith (MO)
						Hardy	Rodgers	Smith (NE)
						Harper	McNerney	Smith (NJ)
						Harris	McSally	Smith (TX)
						Hartzler	Meadows	Stefanik
						Hastings	Meehan	Stewart
						Heck (NV)	Meeks	Stivers
						Heck (WA)	Meng	Stutzman
						Hensarling	Messer	Takano
						Herrera Beutler	Mica	Thompson (CA)
						Hice, Jody B.	Miller (FL)	Thompson (MS)
						Higgins	Miller (MI)	Thompson (PA)
						Hill	Moolenaar	Thornberry
						Himes	Mooney (WV)	Tipton
						Hinojosa	Moulton	Titus
						Holding	Mullin	Tonko
						Honda	Murphy (FL)	Torres
						Hoyer	Murphy (PA)	Trott
						Hudson	Nadler	Tsongas
						Huffman	Napolitano	Turner
						Israel	Neal	Upton
						Jackson Lee	Neugebauer	Valadao
						Jeffries	Newhouse	Van Hollen
						Johnson, E. B.	Noem	Vargas
						Kaptur	Nolan	Veasey
						Keating	Norcross	Vela
						Kennedy	Nugent	Velázquez
						Kildee	Nunes	Visclosky
						Kilmer	O'Rourke	Wagner
						Kind	Olson	Walberg
						Kirkpatrick	Palazzo	Walden

NOT VOTING—10

Brady (TX) Poe (TX) Tiberi
Grijalva Rush Walters, Mimi
Johnson (GA) Sanchez, Loretta
Moore Schrader

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1433

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.

EMERGENCY CITRUS DISEASE RESPONSE ACT OF 2016

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3957) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to temporarily allow expensing of certain costs of replanting citrus plants lost by reason of casualty, 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 Florida (Mr. BUCHANAN) 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 400, nays 20, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 528]

YEAS—400

Adams	DeLauro	Kuster	Abraham	Boyle, Brendan	Cicilline
Aguilar	DelBene	Langevin	Adams	F.	Clark (MA)
Ashford	DeSaulnier	Larsen (WA)	Aderholt	Brady (PA)	Clarke (NY)
Bass	Deutch	Larson (CT)	Aguilar	Brady (TX)	Clawson (FL)
Beatty	Dingell	Lawrence	Allen	Brooks (AL)	Clay
Becerra	Doggett	Lee	Amodei	Brooks (IN)	Cleaver
Bera	Doyle, Michael	Levin	Ashford	Brown (FL)	Clyburn
Beyer	F.	Lewis	Babin	Brownley (CA)	Coffman
Bishop (GA)	Duckworth	Lieu, Ted	Buchanan	Buchanan	Cohen
Blumenauer	Edwards	Lipinski	Buck	Bucshon	Cole
Bonamici	Ellison	Loeb sack	Burgess	Burgess	Collins (GA)
Boyle, Brendan	Engel	Lofgren	Bustos	Bustos	Collins (NY)
F.	Eshoo	Lowenthal	Butterfield	Butterfield	Comstock
Brady (PA)	Esty	Lowe	Byrne	Byrne	Conaway
Brown (FL)	Farr	Lujan Grisham	Calvert	Calvert	Connolly
Brownley (CA)	Foster	(NM)	Capps	Capps	Conyers
Bustos	Frankel (FL)	Luján, Ben Ray	Capuano	Capuano	Cook
Butterfield	Fudge	(NM)	Cardenas	Cardenas	Cooper
Capps	Gabbard	Lynch	Ashford	Carney	Costa
Capuano	Gallego	Maloney,	Babin	Carson (IN)	Costello (PA)
Cárdenas	Garamendi	Carolyn	Barletta	Carter (GA)	Courtney
Carney	Graham	Maloney, Sean	Barr	Carter (TX)	Cramer
Carson (IN)	Grayson	Matsui	Barton	Carter (TX)	Crawford
Cartwright	Green, Al	McCollum	Bass	Cartwright	Crenshaw
Castor (FL)	Green, Gene	McDermott	Beatty	Castor (FL)	Crowley
Castro (TX)	Gutiérrez	McGovern	Becerra	Castro (TX)	Cuellar
Chu, Judy	Hahn	McNerney	Benishkek	Castro (TX)	Cullerson
Cicilline	Heck (WA)	Meeks	Bera	Chabot	Cummins
Clark (MA)	Higgins	Meng	Beyer	Chaffetz	Curbelo (FL)
Clarke (NY)	Himes	Moulton	Bilirakis	Chu, Judy	
Clay	Hinojosa	Murphy (FL)	Bishop (GA)		
Cleaver	Honda	Nadler	Bishop (MI)		
Clyburn	Hoyer	Napolitano	Bishop (UT)		
Cohen	Huffman	Neal	Black		
Connolly	Israel	Nolan	Blackburn		
Conyers	Jackson Lee	Norcross	Blum		
Cooper	Jeffries	O'Rourke	Blumenauer		
Courtney	Johnson, E. B.	Pallone	Bonamici		
Crowley	Kaptur	Pascrell	Bost		
Cuellar	Keating	Pelosi	Boustany		
Cummings	Kennedy	Perlmutter			
Davis (CA)	Kildee	Peters			
Davis, Danny	Kilmer	Peterson			
DeGette	Kind	Pingree			
Delaney	Kirkpatrick	Pocan			

Walorski Wenstrup Yoder
Walz Westerman Yoho
Wasserman Westmoreland Young (AK)
Schultz Williams Young (IA)
Waters, Maxine Wilson (FL) Young (IN)
Watson Coleman Wilson (SC) Zeldin
Weber (TX) Womack Zinke
Webster (FL) Woodall
Welch Yarmuth

NAYS—20

Amash Labrador Rokita
Brat Lummis Sanford
Bridenstine McDermott Smith (WA)
Griffith Mulvaney Speier
Grothman Palmer Swalwell (CA)
Huelskamp Polis Wittman
Jones Ribble

NOT VOTING—11

Duncan (SC) Poe (TX) Tiberi
Grijalva Rush Walker
Joyce Sanchez, Loretta Walters, Mimi
Moore Schrader

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1439

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.

Stated for:

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, regarding the question considered earlier today on passage of H.R. 3957, the Emergency Citrus Disease Response Act of 2016 (Rollcall No. 528), I am recorded as voting "no." I intended to vote "yes."

EXPANDING SENIORS RECEIVING DIALYSIS CHOICE ACT OF 2016

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5659) to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act with respect to expanding Medicare Advantage coverage for individuals with end-stage renal disease (ESRD), 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 Missouri (Mr. SMITH) 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 423, nays 0, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 529]

YEAS—423

Abraham Bera Brady (TX)
Adams Beyer Brat
Aderholt Bilirakis Bridenstine
Aguilar Bishop (GA) Brooks (AL)
Allen Bishop (MI) Brooks (IN)
Amash Bishop (UT) Brown (FL)
Amodi Black Brownley (CA)
Ashford Blackburn Buchanan
Babin Blum Buck
Barletta Blumenauer Bucshon
Barr Bonamici Burgess
Barton Bost Bustos
Bass Boustany Butterfield
Beatty Boyle, Brendan Byrne
Becerra F. Calvert
Benishek Brady (PA) Capps

Capuano Graham Luján, Ben Ray
Cárdenas Granger (NM)
Carney Graves (GA) Lummis
Carson (IN) Graves (LA) Lynch
Carter (GA) Graves (MO) MacArthur
Carter (TX) Grayson Maloney,
Cartwright Green, Al Carolyn
Castor (FL) Green, Gene Maloney, Sean
Castro (TX) Griffith Marchant
Chabot Grothman Mariner
Chaffetz Guinta Massie
Chu, Judy Guthrie Matsui
Ciilline Gutiérrez McCarthy
Clark (MA) Hahn McCaul
Clarke (NY) Hanna McClintock
Clawson (FL) Hardy McCollum
Clay Harper McDermott
Cleaver Harris McGovern
Clyburn Hartzler McHenry
Coffman Hastings McKinley
Cohen Heck (NV) McMorris
Cole Heck (WA) Rodgers
Collins (GA) Hensarling McNeerney
Collins (NY) Herrera Beutler McSally
Comstock Hice, Jody B. Meadows
Conaway Higgins Meehan
Conolly Hill Meeks
Conyers Himes Meng
Cook Hinojosa Messer
Cooper Holding Mica
Costa Miller (FL) Miller (MI)
Costello (PA) Hoyer Moolenaar
Courtney Hudson Mooney (WV)
Cramer Huelskamp Moulton
Crawford Huffman Mullin
Crenshaw Huffnagle Mullin
Crowley Huizenga (MI) Mulvaney
Cuellar Hultgren Murphy (FL)
Culberson Hunter Murphy (PA)
Cummings Hurd (TX) Nadler
Curbelo (FL) Hurt (VA) Napolitano
Davidson Israel Neal
Davis (CA) Issa Neugebauer
Davis, Danny Jackson Lee Newhouse
Davis, Rodney Jeffries Noem
DeFazio Jenkins (KS) Nolan
DeGette Jenkins (WV) Norcross
Delaney Johnson (GA) Nugent
DeLauro Johnson (OH) Nunes
DelBene Johnson, E. B. O'Rourke
Denham Johnson, Sam Olson
Dent Jolly Palazzo
DeSantis Jones Pallone
DeSaulnier Jordan Palmer
DesJarlais Joyce Pascrell
Deutch Kaptur Paulsen
Diaz-Balart Katko Payne
Dingell Keating Pearce
Doggett Kelly (IL) Pelosi
Dold Kelly (MS) Perlmutter
Donovan Kelly (PA) Perry
Doyle, Michael Kennedy Peters
F. Kildee Peterson
Duckworth Kilmer Pingree
Duffy Kind Pittenger
Duncan (SC) King (IA) Pitts
Duncan (TN) King (NY) Pocan
Edwards Kinzinger (IL) Poliquin
Ellison Kirkpatrick Polis
Ellmers (NC) Kline Pompeo
Emmer (MN) Knight Posey
Engel Kuster Price (NC)
Eshoo Labrador Price, Tom
Esty LaHood Quigley
Farenthold LaMalfa Rangel
Farr Lamborn Ratcliffe
Fincher Lance Reed
Fitzpatrick Langevin Reichert
Fleischmann Larsen (WA) Renacci
Fleming Larson (CT) Ribble
Flores Latta Rice (NY)
Forbes Lawrence Rice (SC)
Fortenberry Lee Richmond
Foster Levin Rigell
Foxy Lewis Roby
Frankel (FL) Lieu, Ted Roe (TN)
Franks (AZ) Lipinski Rogers (AL)
Frelinghuysen LoBiondo Rogers (KY)
Fudge Loebach Rohrabacher
Gabbard Loggren Rokita
Gallego Long Rooney (FL)
Garamendi Loudermilk Ros-Lehtinen
Garrett Love Roskam
Gibbs Lowenthal Ross
Gibson Lowey Rothfus
Gohmert Lucas Rouzer
Goodlatte Luetkemeyer Roybal-Allard
Gosar Lujan Grisham Royce
Gowdy (NM) Ruiz

Ruppersberger Smith (TX) Walberg
Russell Smith (WA) Walden
Ryan (OH) Speler Walker
Salmon Stefanik Walorski
Sánchez, Linda Stewart Walz
T. Stivers Wasserman
Sanford Stutzman Schultz
Sarbanes Swalwell (CA) Waters, Maxine
Scalise Takano Watson Coleman
Schakowsky Thompson (CA) Weber (TX)
Schiff Thompson (MS) Webster (FL)
Schweikert Thompson (PA) Welch
Scott (VA) Thornberry Wenstrup
Scott, Austin Tipton Westerman
Scott, David Titus Westmoreland
Sensenbrenner Tonko Williams
Serrano Torres Wilson (FL)
Sessions Trott Wilson (SC)
Sewell (AL) Tsongas Wittman
Sherman Turner Womack
Shimkus Upton Woodall
Shuster Valadao Yarmuth
Simpson Van Hollen Yoder
Sinema Vargas Yoho
Sires Veasey Young (AK)
Slaughter Vela Young (IA)
Smith (MO) Velázquez Young (IN)
Smith (NE) Visclosky Zeldin
Smith (NJ) Wagner Zinke

NOT VOTING—8

Grijalva Rush Tiberi
Moore Sanchez, Loretta Walters, Mimi
Poe (TX) Schrader

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1445

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.

SUSTAINING HEALTHCARE INTEGRITY AND FAIR TREATMENT ACT OF 2016

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5713) to provide for the extension of certain long-term care hospital Medicare payment rules, clarify the application of rules on the calculation of hospital length of stay to certain moratorium-excepted long-term care hospitals, and for other purposes, 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 Ohio (Mr. TIBERI) 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 420, nays 3, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 530]

YEAS—420

Abraham Barton Bishop (UT)
Adams Bass Black
Aderholt Beatty Blackburn
Aguilar Becerra Blum
Allen Benishek Blumenauer
Amodi Bera Bonamici
Ashford Beyer Bost
Babin Bilirakis Boustany
Barletta Bishop (GA) Boyle, Brendan
Barr Bishop (MI) F.

Brady (PA)	Fortenberry	Lewis	Roby	Shimkus	Vela	Bera	Ellison	Kline
Brady (TX)	Foster	Lieu, Ted	Roe (TN)	Shuster	Velázquez	Beyer	Ellmers (NC)	Knight
Brat	Fox	Lipinski	Rogers (AL)	Simpson	Visclosky	Bilirakis	Emmer (MN)	Kuster
Bridenstine	Frankel (FL)	LoBiondo	Rogers (KY)	Sinema	Wagner	Bishop (GA)	Engel	Labrador
Brooks (AL)	Franks (AZ)	Loebach	Rohrabacher	Sires	Walberg	Bishop (MI)	Eshoo	LaHood
Brooks (IN)	Frelinghuysen	Loftgren	Rokita	Slaughter	Walden	Bishop (UT)	Esty	LaMalfa
Brown (FL)	Fudge	Long	Rooney (FL)	Smith (MO)	Walker	Black	Farenthold	Lamborn
Brownley (CA)	Gabbard	Loudermilk	Ros-Lehtinen	Smith (NE)	Walorski	Blackburn	Farr	Lance
Buchanan	Gallego	Love	Roskam	Smith (NJ)	Walz	Blum	Fincher	Langevin
Buck	Garamendi	Lowenthal	Ross	Smith (TX)	Wasserman	Blumenauer	Fitzpatrick	Larsen (WA)
Bucshon	Garrett	Lowe	Rothfus	Smith (WA)	Schultz	Bonamici	Fleischmann	Larson (CT)
Burgess	Gibbs	Lucas	Rouzer	Speier	Waters, Maxine	Bost	Fleming	Latta
Bustos	Gibson	Luetkemeyer	Roybal-Allard	Stefanik	Watson Coleman	Boustany	Flores	Lawrence
Butterfield	Gohmert	Lujan Grisham	Royce	Stewart	Weber (TX)	Boyle, Brendan	Forbes	Lee
Byrne	Goodlatte	(NM)	Ruiz	Stivers	Webster (FL)	F.	Fortenberry	Levin
Calvert	Gosar	Luján, Ben Ray	Ruppertsberger	Stutzman	Welch	Brady (PA)	Foster	Lewis
Capps	Gowdy	(NM)	Russell	Swalwell (CA)	Wenstrup	Brady (TX)	Fox	Lieu, Ted
Capuano	Graham	Lummis	Ryan (OH)	Takano	Westerman	Brat	Frankel (FL)	Lipinski
Cardenas	Granger	Lynch	Salmon	Thompson (CA)	Westmoreland	Bridenstine	Franks (AZ)	LoBiondo
Carney	Graves (GA)	MacArthur	Sánchez, Linda	Thompson (MS)	Williams	Brooks (AL)	Frelinghuysen	Loebach
Carson (IN)	Graves (LA)	Maloney,	T.	Thompson (PA)	Wilson (FL)	Brooks (IN)	Fudge	Loftgren
Carter (GA)	Graves (MO)	Carolyn	Sarbanes	Thornberry	Wilson (SC)	Gabbard	Brown (FL)	Long
Carter (TX)	Grayson	Maloney, Sean	Scalise	Tipton	Wittman	Brownley (CA)	Gallego	Loudermilk
Cartwright	Green, Al	Marchant	Schakowsky	Titus	Womack	Buchanan	Garamendi	Love
Castor (FL)	Green, Gene	Marino	Schiff	Torres	Woodall	Buck	Garrett	Lowenthal
Castro (TX)	Griffith	Massie	Schweikert	Tonko	Yarmuth	Bucshon	Gibbs	Lowe
Chabot	Grothman	Matsui	Scott (VA)	Trott	Yoder	Burgess	Gibson	Lucas
Chaffetz	Guinta	McCarthy	Scott, Austin	Tsongas	Yoho	Bustos	Gohmert	Luetkemeyer
Chu, Judy	Guthrie	McCaul	Scott, David	Turner	Young (AK)	Butterfield	Goodlatte	Lujan Grisham
Ciilline	Gutiérrez	McClintock	Sensenbrenner	Upton	Young (IA)	Byrne	Gosar	(NM)
Clark (MA)	Hahn	McCollum	Serrano	Valadao	Young (IN)	Calvert	Gowdy	Luján, Ben Ray
Clarke (NY)	Hanna	McDermott	Sessions	Van Hollen	Zeldin	Capps	Graham	(NM)
Clawson (FL)	Hardy	McGovern	Sewell (AL)	Vargas	Zinke	Capuano	Granger	Lummis
Clay	Harper	McHenry	Sherman	Veasey		Cardenas	Graves (GA)	Lynch
Cleaver	Harris	McKinley				Carney	Graves (LA)	MacArthur
Clyburn	Hartzler	McMorris	Amash	Jones	Sanford	Carson (IN)	Graves (MO)	Maloney,
Coffman	Hastings	Rodgers				Carter (GA)	Grayson	Carolyn
Cohen	Heck (NV)	McNerney				Carter (TX)	Green, Al	Maloney, Sean
Cole	Heck (WA)	McSally				Cartwright	Green, Gene	Marchant
Collins (GA)	Hensarling	Meadows	Grijalva	Rush	Tiberi	Castor (FL)	Griffith	Marino
Collins (NY)	Herrera Beutler	Meehan	Moore	Sanchez, Loretta	Walters, Mimi	Castro (TX)	Grothman	Massie
Comstock	Hice, Jody B.	Meeks	Poe (TX)	Schrader		Chabot	Guinta	Matsui
Conaway	Higgins	Meng				Chaffetz	Guthrie	McCarthy
Connolly	Hill	Messer				Chu, Judy	Gutiérrez	McCaul
Conyers	Himes	Mica				Ciilline	Hahn	McClintock
Cook	Hinojosa	Miller (FL)				Clark (MA)	Hanna	McCollum
Cooper	Holding	Miller (MI)				Clarke (NY)	Hardy	McDermott
Costa	Honda	Moolenaar				Clawson (FL)	Harper	McGovern
Costello (PA)	Hoyer	Mooney (WV)				Clay	Harris	McHenry
Courtney	Hudson	Moulton				Cleaver	Hartzler	McKinley
Cramer	Huelskamp	Mullin				Clyburn	Hastings	McMorris
Crawford	Huffman	Mulvaney				Coffman	Heck (NV)	Rodgers
Crenshaw	Huizenga (MI)	Murphy (FL)				Cohen	Heck (WA)	McNerney
Crowley	Hultgren	Murphy (PA)				Cole	Hensarling	McSally
Cuellar	Hunter	Nadler				Collins (GA)	Herrera Beutler	Meadows
Culberson	Hurd (TX)	Napolitano				Collins (NY)	Hice, Jody B.	Meehan
Cummings	Hurt (VA)	Neal				Comstock	Higgins	Meeks
Curbelo (FL)	Israel	Neugebauer				Conaway	Hill	Meng
Davidson	Issa	Newhouse				Connolly	Himes	Messer
Davis (CA)	Jackson Lee	Noem				Conyers	Hinojosa	Mica
Davis, Danny	Jeffries	Nolan				Cook	Holding	Miller (FL)
Davis, Rodney	Jenkins (KS)	Norcross				Cooper	Honda	Miller (MI)
DeFazio	Jenkins (WV)	Nugent				Cooper	Hoyer	Moolenaar
DeGette	Johnson (GA)	Nunes				Costa	Hudson	Mooney (WV)
Delaney	Johnson (OH)	O'Rourke				Costello (PA)	Hudson	Moulton
DeLauro	Johnson, E. B.	Olson				Courtney	Huelskamp	Mullin
DelBene	Johnson, Sam	Palazzo				Cramer	Huffman	Mulvaney
Denham	Jolly	Pallone				Crawford	Huizenga (MI)	Murphy (FL)
Dent	Jordan	Palmer				Crenshaw	Hultgren	Murphy (PA)
DeSantis	Joyce	Pascarell				Crowley	Hunter	Nadler
DeSaulnier	Kaptur	Paulsen				Cuellar	Hurd (TX)	Napolitano
DesJarlais	Katko	Payne				Culberson	Hurt (VA)	Neal
Deutch	Keating	Pearce				Cummings	Israel	Neugebauer
Diaz-Balart	Kelly (IL)	Pelosi				Curbelo (FL)	Issa	Newhouse
Dingell	Kelly (MS)	Perlmutter				Davidson	Jackson Lee	Noem
Doggett	Kelly (PA)	Perry				Davis (CA)	Jeffries	Nolan
Dold	Kennedy	Peters				Davis, Danny	Jenkins (KS)	Norcross
Donovan	Kildee	Peterson				Davis, Rodney	Jenkins (WV)	Nugent
Doyle, Michael	Kilmer	Pingree				DeFazio	Johnson (GA)	Nunes
F.	Kind	Pittenger				DeGette	Johnson (OH)	O'Rourke
Duckworth	King (IA)	Pitts				Delaney	Johnson, E. B.	Olson
Duffy	King (NY)	Pocan				DeLauro	Johnson, Sam	Olson
Duncan (SC)	Kinzinger (IL)	Poliquin				DelBene	Jolly	Palazzo
Duncan (TN)	Kirkpatrick	Polis				Denham	Jones	Pallone
Edwards	Kline	Pompeo				Dent	Jordan	Palmer
Ellison	Knight	Posey				DeSantis	Joyce	Pascarell
Ellmers (NC)	Kuster	Price (NC)				DeSaulnier	Kaptur	Paulsen
Emmer (MN)	Labrador	Price, Tom				DesJarlais	Katko	Payne
Engel	LaHood	Quigley				Deutch	Keating	Pearce
Eshoo	LaMalfa	Rangel				Diaz-Balart	Kelly (IL)	Pelosi
Esty	Lamborn	Ratcliffe				Dingell	Kelly (MS)	Perlmutter
Farenthold	Lance	Reed				Doggett	Kelly (PA)	Perry
Farr	Langevin	Reichert				Dold	Kennedy	Peters
Fincher	Larsen (WA)	Renacci				Donovan	Kildee	Peterson
Fitzpatrick	Larson (CT)	Ribble				Doyle, Michael	Kilmer	Pingree
Fleischmann	Latta	Rice (NY)				F.	Kind	Pittenger
Fleming	Lawrence	Rice (SC)				Duckworth	King (IA)	Pitts
Flores	Lee	Richmond				Duffy	King (NY)	Pocan
Forbes	Levin	Rigell				Duncan (TN)	Kinzinger (IL)	Poliquin
						Edwards	Kirkpatrick	Polis

NAYS—3

NOT VOTING—8

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1452

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.

CONTINUING ACCESS TO HOSPITALS ACT OF 2016

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5613) to provide for the extension of the enforcement instruction on supervision requirements for outpatient therapeutic services in critical access and small rural hospitals through 2016, 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 gentlewoman from Kansas (Ms. JENKINS) 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 420, nays 0, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 531]

YEAS—420

Abraham	Amash	Barr
Adams	Amodei	Bass
Aderholt	Ashford	Beatty
Aguilar	Babin	Becerra
Allen	Barletta	Benishke

Pompeo	Schakowsky	Turner
Posey	Schiff	Upton
Price (NC)	Schweikert	Valadao
Price, Tom	Scott (VA)	Van Hollen
Quigley	Scott, Austin	Vargas
Rangel	Scott, David	Veasey
Ratcliffe	Sensenbrenner	Velázquez
Reed	Serrano	Visclosky
Reichert	Sessions	Wagner
Renacci	Sewell (AL)	Walberg
Ribble	Sherman	Walden
Rice (NY)	Shimkus	Walker
Rice (SC)	Shuster	Walorski
Richmond	Simpson	Walz
Rigell	Sinema	Wasserman
Roby	Sires	Schultz
Roe (TN)	Slaughter	Waters, Maxine
Rogers (AL)	Smith (MO)	Watson Coleman
Rogers (KY)	Smith (NE)	Weber (TX)
Rohrabacher	Smith (NJ)	Webster (FL)
Rokita	Smith (TX)	Welch
Rooney (FL)	Smith (WA)	Wenstrup
Ros-Lehtinen	Speier	Westerman
Roskam	Stefanik	Westmoreland
Ross	Stewart	Williams
Rothfus	Stivers	Wilson (FL)
Rouzer	Stutzman	Wilson (SC)
Roybal-Allard	Swalwell (CA)	Wittman
Royce	Takano	Womack
Ruiz	Thompson (CA)	Woodall
Ruppersberger	Thompson (MS)	Yarmuth
Russell	Thompson (PA)	Yoder
Ryan (OH)	Thornberry	Yoho
Salmon	Titus	Young (AK)
Sánchez, Linda	Tonko	Young (IA)
T.	Torres	Young (IN)
Sanford	Trotter	Zeldin
Sarbanes	Tsongas	Zinke
Scalise		

NOT VOTING—11

Barton	Poe (TX)	Tiberi
Duncan (SC)	Rush	Vela
Grijalva	Sánchez, Loretta	Walters, Mimi
Moore	Schradler	

□ 1458

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. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall Nos. 528 (motion to suspend the rules and pass, as amended H.R. 3957), 529 (motion to suspend the rules and pass, as amended H.R. 5659), 530 (motion to suspend the rules and pass, as amended H.R. 5713) and 531 (motion to suspend the rules and pass, as amended H.R. 5613), I did not cast my votes due to illness. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on all of the votes.

KOREAN WAR VETERANS MEMORIAL WALL OF REMEMBRANCE ACT OF 2016

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker’s table the bill (H.R. 1475) to authorize a Wall of Remembrance as part of the Korean War Veterans Memorial and to allow certain private contributions to fund that Wall of Remembrance, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Korean War Veterans Memorial Wall of Remembrance Act”.

SEC. 2. WALL OF REMEMBRANCE.

(a) AUTHORIZATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 8908(c) of title 40, United States Code, the Korean War Veterans Memorial Foundation, Inc., may construct a Wall of Remembrance at the site of the Korean War Veterans Memorial.

(2) REQUIREMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Wall of Remembrance shall include a list of names of members of the Armed Forces of the United States who died in the Korean War, as determined by the Secretary of Defense, in accordance with subparagraph (B).

(B) CRITERIA; SUBMISSION TO THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.—The Secretary of Defense shall—

(i) establish eligibility criteria for the inclusion of names on the Wall of Remembrance under subparagraph (A); and

(ii) provide to the Secretary of the Interior a final list of names for inclusion on the Wall of Remembrance under subparagraph (A) that meet the criteria established under clause (i).

(3) ADDITIONAL INFORMATION.—The Wall of Remembrance may include other information about the Korean War, including the number of members of the Armed Forces of the United States, the Korean Augmentation to the United States Army, the Republic of Korea Armed Forces, and the other nations of the United Nations Command who, in regards to the Korean War—

(A) were killed in action;

(B) were wounded in action;

(C) are listed as missing in action; or

(D) were prisoners of war.

(b) COMMEMORATIVE WORKS ACT.—Except as provided in subsection (a)(1), chapter 89 of title 40, United States Code (commonly known as the “Commemorative Works Act”), shall apply.

(c) NO FEDERAL FUNDS.—No Federal funds may be used to construct the Wall of Remembrance.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

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

There was no objection.

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

There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GLOBAL ANTI-POACHING ACT

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker’s table the bill (H.R. 2494) to support global anti-poaching efforts, strengthen the capacity of partner countries to counter wildlife trafficking, designate major wildlife trafficking countries, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the “Eliminate, Neutralize, and Disrupt Wildlife Trafficking Act of 2016”.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

Sec. 2. Definitions.

TITLE I—PURPOSES AND POLICY

Sec. 101. Purposes.

Sec. 102. Statement of United States policy.

TITLE II—REPORT ON MAJOR WILDLIFE TRAFFICKING COUNTRIES

Sec. 201. Report.

TITLE III—FRAMEWORK FOR INTERAGENCY RESPONSE

Sec. 301. Presidential Task Force on Wildlife Trafficking.

TITLE IV—PROGRAMS TO ADDRESS THE ESCALATING WILDLIFE TRAFFICKING CRISIS

Sec. 401. Anti-poaching programs.

Sec. 402. Anti-trafficking programs.

Sec. 403. Engagement of United States diplomatic missions.

Sec. 404. Community conservation.

TITLE V—OTHER ACTIONS RELATING TO WILDLIFE TRAFFICKING PROGRAMS

Sec. 501. Amendments to Fisherman’s Protective Act of 1967.

Sec. 502. Wildlife trafficking violations as predicate offenses under money laundering statute.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(A) the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

(2) CO-CHAIRS OF THE TASK FORCE.—The term “Co-Chairs of the Task Force” means the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Attorney General, as established pursuant to Executive Order 13648.

(3) COMMUNITY CONSERVATION.—The term “community conservation” means an approach to conservation that recognizes the rights of local people to manage, or benefit directly and indirectly from wildlife and other natural resources in a long-term biologically viable manner and includes—

(A) devolving management and governance to local communities to create positive conditions for resource use that takes into account current and future ecological requirements; and

(B) building the capacity of communities for conservation and natural resource management.

(4) COUNTRY OF CONCERN.—The term “country of concern” refers to a foreign country specially designated by the Secretary of State pursuant to subsection (b) of section 201 as a major source of wildlife trafficking products or their derivatives, a major transit point of wildlife trafficking products or their derivatives, or a major consumer of wildlife trafficking products, in which the government has actively engaged in or knowingly profited from the trafficking of endangered or threatened species.

(5) FOCUS COUNTRY.—The term “focus country” refers to a foreign country determined by the Secretary of State to be a major source of wildlife trafficking products or their derivatives, a major transit point of wildlife trafficking products or their derivatives, or a major consumer of wildlife trafficking products.

(6) DEFENSE ARTICLE; DEFENSE SERVICE; SIGNIFICANT MILITARY EQUIPMENT; TRAINING.—The terms “defense article”, “defense service”, “significant military equipment”, and “training” have the meanings given such terms in section 47 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2794).

(7) IMPLEMENTATION PLAN.—The term “Implementation Plan” means the Implementation

Plan for the National Strategy for Combating Wildlife Trafficking released on February 11, 2015, a modification of that plan, or a successor plan.

(8) NATIONAL STRATEGY.—The term “National Strategy” means the National Strategy for Combating Wildlife Trafficking published on February 11, 2014, a modification of that strategy, or a successor strategy.

(9) NATIONAL WILDLIFE SERVICES.—The term “national wildlife services” refers to the ministries and government bodies designated to manage matters pertaining to wildlife management, including poaching or trafficking, in a focus country.

(10) SECURITY FORCE.—The term “security force” means a military, law enforcement, gendarmerie, park ranger, or any other security force with a responsibility for protecting wildlife and natural habitats.

(11) TASK FORCE.—The term “Task Force” means the Presidential Task Force on Wildlife Trafficking, as established by Executive Order 13648 (78 Fed. Reg. 40621) and modified by section 201.

(12) WILDLIFE TRAFFICKING.—The term “wildlife trafficking” refers to the poaching or other illegal taking of protected or managed species and the illegal trade in wildlife and their related parts and products.

TITLE I—PURPOSES AND POLICY

SEC. 101. PURPOSES.

The purposes of this Act are—

(1) to support a collaborative, interagency approach to address wildlife trafficking;

(2) to protect and conserve the remaining populations of wild elephants, rhinoceroses, and other species threatened by poaching and the illegal wildlife trade;

(3) to disrupt regional and global transnational organized criminal networks and to prevent the illegal wildlife trade from being used as a source of financing for criminal groups that undermine United States and global security interests;

(4) to prevent wildlife poaching and trafficking from being a means to make a living in focus countries;

(5) to support the efforts of, and collaborate with, individuals, communities, local organizations, and foreign governments to combat poaching and wildlife trafficking;

(6) to assist focus countries in implementation of national wildlife anti-trafficking and poaching laws; and

(7) to ensure that United States assistance to prevent and suppress illicit wildlife trafficking is carefully planned and coordinated, and that it is systematically and rationally prioritized on the basis of detailed analysis of the nature and severity of threats to wildlife and the willingness and ability of foreign partners to cooperate effectively toward these ends.

SEC. 102. STATEMENT OF UNITED STATES POLICY.

It is the policy of the United States—

(1) to take immediate actions to stop the illegal global trade in wildlife and wildlife products and associated transnational organized crime;

(2) to provide technical and other forms of assistance to help focus countries halt the poaching of elephants, rhinoceroses, and other imperiled species and end the illegal trade in wildlife and wildlife products, including by providing training and assistance in—

(A) wildlife protection and management of wildlife populations;

(B) anti-poaching and effective management of protected areas including community managed and privately-owned lands;

(C) local engagement of security forces in anti-poaching responsibilities, where appropriate;

(D) wildlife trafficking investigative techniques, including forensic tools;

(E) transparency and corruption issues;

(F) management, tracking, and inventory of confiscated wildlife contraband;

(G) demand reduction strategies in countries that lack the means and resources to conduct them; and

(H) bilateral and multilateral agreements and cooperation;

(3) to employ appropriate assets and resources of the United States Government in a coordinated manner to curtail poaching and disrupt and dismantle illegal wildlife trade networks and the financing of those networks in a manner appropriate for each focus country;

(4) to build upon the National Strategy and Implementation Plan to further combat wildlife trafficking in a holistic manner and guide the response of the United States Government to ensure progress in the fight against wildlife trafficking; and

(5) to recognize the ties of wildlife trafficking to broader forms of transnational organized criminal activities, including trafficking, and where applicable, to focus on those crimes in a coordinated, cross-cutting manner.

TITLE II—REPORT ON MAJOR WILDLIFE TRAFFICKING COUNTRIES

SEC. 201. REPORT.

(a) REPORT.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Commerce, shall submit to Congress a report that lists each country determined by the Secretary of State to be a focus country within the meaning of this Act.

(b) SPECIAL DESIGNATION.—In each report required under subsection (a), the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Commerce, shall identify each country of concern listed in the report the government of which has actively engaged in or knowingly profited from the trafficking of endangered or threatened species.

(c) SUNSET.—This section shall terminate on the date that is 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

TITLE III—FRAMEWORK FOR INTERAGENCY RESPONSE

SEC. 301. PRESIDENTIAL TASK FORCE ON WILDLIFE TRAFFICKING.

(a) RESPONSIBILITIES.—In addition to the functions required by Executive Order 13648 (78 Fed. Reg. 40621), the Task Force shall be informed by the Secretary of State’s annual report required under section 201 and considering all available information, ensure that relevant United States Government agencies—

(1) collaborate, to the greatest extent practicable, with the national wildlife services, or other relevant bodies of each focus country to prepare, not later than 90 days after the date of submission of the report required under section 201(a), a United States mission assessment of the threats to wildlife in that focus country and an assessment of the capacity of that country to address wildlife trafficking;

(2) collaborate, to the greatest extent practicable, with relevant ministries, national wildlife services, or other relevant bodies of each focus country to prepare, not later than 180 days after preparation of the assessment referred to in paragraph (1), a United States mission strategic plan that includes recommendations for addressing wildlife trafficking, taking into account any regional or national strategies for addressing wildlife trafficking in a focus country developed before the preparation of such assessment;

(3) coordinate efforts among United States Federal agencies and non-Federal partners, including missions, domestic and international organizations, the private sector, and other global partners, to implement the strategic plans required by paragraph (2) in each focus country;

(4) not less frequently than annually, consult and coordinate with stakeholders qualified to provide advice, assistance, and information regarding effective support for anti-poaching activities, coordination of regional law enforce-

ment efforts, development of and support for effective legal enforcement mechanisms, and development of strategies to reduce illicit trade and reduce consumer demand for illegally traded wildlife and wildlife products, and other relevant topics under this Act; and

(5) coordinate or carry out other functions as are necessary to implement this Act.

(b) DUPLICATION AND EFFICIENCY.—The Task Force shall—

(1) ensure that the activities of the Federal agencies involved in carrying out efforts under this Act are coordinated and not duplicated; and

(2) encourage efficiencies and coordination among the efforts of Federal agencies and interagency initiatives ongoing as of the date of the enactment of this Act to address trafficking activities, including trafficking of wildlife, humans, weapons, and narcotics, illegal trade, transnational organized crime, or other illegal activities.

(c) CONSISTENCY WITH AGENCY RESPONSIBILITIES.—The Task Force shall carry out its responsibilities under this Act in a manner consistent with the authorities and responsibilities of agencies represented on the Task Force.

(d) TASK FORCE STRATEGIC REVIEW.—One year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Task Force shall submit a strategic assessment of its work and provide a briefing to the appropriate congressional committees that shall include—

(1) a review and assessment of the Task Force’s implementation of this Act, identifying successes, failures, and gaps in its work, or that of agencies represented on the Task Force, including detailed descriptions of—

(A) what approaches, initiatives, or programs have succeeded best in increasing the willingness and capacity of focus countries to suppress and prevent illegal wildlife trafficking, and what approaches, initiatives, or programs have not succeeded as well as hoped; and

(B) which foreign governments subject to subsections (a) and (b) of section 201 have proven to be the most successful partners in suppressing and preventing illegal wildlife trafficking, which focus countries have not proven to be so, and what factors contributed to these results in each country discussed;

(2) a description of each Task Force member agency’s priorities and objectives for combating wildlife trafficking;

(3) an account of total United States funding each year since fiscal year 2014 for all government agencies and programs involved in countering poaching and wildlife trafficking;

(4) an account of total United States funding since fiscal year 2014 to support the activities of the Task Force, including administrative overhead costs and congressional reporting; and

(5) recommendations for how to improve United States and international efforts to suppress and prevent illegal wildlife trafficking in the future, based upon the Task Force’s experience as of the time of the review.

(e) TERMINATION OF TASK FORCE.—The statutory authorization for the Task Force provided by this Act shall terminate 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act or such earlier date that the President terminates the Task Force by rescinding, superseding, or otherwise modifying relevant portions of Executive Order 13648.

TITLE IV—PROGRAMS TO ADDRESS THE ESCALATING WILDLIFE TRAFFICKING CRISIS

SEC. 401. ANTI-POACHING PROGRAMS.

(a) WILDLIFE LAW ENFORCEMENT PROFESSIONAL TRAINING AND COORDINATION ACTIVITIES.—The Secretary of State and the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development, in collaboration with the heads of other relevant United States agencies and nongovernmental partners where appropriate, may provide assistance to focus countries to carry out the recommendations made in the

strategic plan required by section 301(a)(2), among other goals, to improve the effectiveness of wildlife law enforcement in regions and countries that have demonstrated capacity, willingness, and need for assistance.

(b) **SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING SECURITY ASSISTANCE TO COUNTER WILDLIFE TRAFFICKING AND POACHING IN AFRICA.**—It is the sense of Congress that the United States should continue to provide defense articles (not including significant military equipment), defense services, and related training to appropriate security forces of countries of Africa for the purposes of countering wildlife trafficking and poaching.

SEC. 402. ANTI-TRAFFICKING PROGRAMS.

(a) **INVESTIGATIVE CAPACITY BUILDING.**—The Secretary of State and the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development, in collaboration with the heads of other relevant United States agencies and communities, regions, and governments in focus countries, may design and implement programs in focus countries to carry out the recommendations made in the strategic plan required under section 301(a)(2) among other goals, with clear and measurable targets and indicators of success, to increase the capacity of wildlife law enforcement and customs and border security officers in focus countries.

(b) **TRANSNATIONAL PROGRAMS.**—The Secretary of State and the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development, in collaboration with other relevant United States agencies, nongovernmental partners, and international bodies, and in collaboration with communities, regions, and governments in focus countries, may design and implement programs, including support for Wildlife Enforcement Networks, in focus countries to carry out the recommendations made in the strategic plan required under section 301(a)(2), among other goals, to better understand and combat the transnational trade in illegal wildlife.

SEC. 403. ENGAGEMENT OF UNITED STATES DIPLOMATIC MISSIONS.

As soon as practicable but not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, each chief of mission to a focus country should begin to implement the recommendations contained in the strategic plan required under section 301(a)(2), among other goals, for the country.

SEC. 404. COMMUNITY CONSERVATION.

The Secretary of State, in collaboration with the United States Agency for International Development, heads of other relevant United States agencies, the private sector, nongovernmental organizations, and other development partners, may provide support in focus countries to carry out the recommendations made in the strategic plan required under section 301(a)(2) as such recommendations relate to the development, scaling, and replication of community wildlife conservancies and community conservation programs in focus countries to assist with rural stability and greater security for people and wildlife, empower and support communities to manage or benefit from their wildlife resources in a long-term biologically viable manner, and reduce the threat of poaching and trafficking, including through—

(1) promoting conservation-based enterprises and incentives, such as eco-tourism and stewardship-oriented agricultural production, that empower communities to manage wildlife, natural resources, and community ventures where appropriate, by ensuring they benefit from well-managed wildlife populations;

(2) helping create alternative livelihoods to poaching by mitigating wildlife trafficking, helping support rural stability, greater security for people and wildlife, responsible economic development, and economic incentives to conserve wildlife populations;

(3) engaging regional businesses and the private sector to develop goods and services to aid in anti-poaching and anti-trafficking measures;

(4) working with communities to develop secure and safe methods of sharing information with enforcement officials;

(5) providing technical assistance to support land use stewardship plans to improve the economic, environmental, and social outcomes in community-owned or -managed lands;

(6) supporting community anti-poaching efforts, including policing and informant networks;

(7) working with community and national governments to develop relevant policy and regulatory frameworks to enable and promote community conservation programs, including supporting law enforcement engagement with wildlife protection authorities to promote information-sharing; and

(8) working with national governments to ensure that communities have timely and effective support from national authorities to mitigate risks that communities may face when engaging in anti-poaching and anti-trafficking activities.

TITLE V—OTHER ACTIONS RELATING TO WILDLIFE TRAFFICKING PROGRAMS

SEC. 501. AMENDMENTS TO FISHERMAN'S PROTECTIVE ACT OF 1967.

Section 8 of the Fisherman's Protective Act of 1967 (22 U.S.C. 1978) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by inserting “, in consultation with the Secretary of State,” after “Secretary of Commerce”;

(B) in paragraph (2), by inserting “, in consultation with the Secretary of State,” after “Secretary of the Interior”;

(C) in paragraph (3), by inserting “in consultation with the Secretary of State,” after “, as appropriate,”;

(D) by redesigning paragraph (4) as paragraph (5); and

(E) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following new paragraph:

“(4) The Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of the Interior shall each report to Congress each certification to the President made by such Secretary under this subsection, within 15 days after making such certification.”; and

(2) in subsection (d), by inserting “in consultation with the Secretary of State,” after “as the case may be.”.

SEC. 502. WILDLIFE TRAFFICKING VIOLATIONS AS PREDICATE OFFENSES UNDER MONEY LAUNDERING STATUTE.

Section 1956(c)(7) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (E), by striking “; or” and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in subparagraph (F), by striking the semicolon and inserting “; or”;

(3) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(G) any act that is a criminal violation of subparagraph (A), (B), (C), (D), (E), or (F) of paragraph (1) of section 9(a) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1538(a)(1)), section 2203 of the African Elephant Conservation Act (16 U.S.C. 4223), or section 7(a) of the Rhinoceros and Tiger Conservation Act of 1994 (16 U.S.C. 5305a(a)), if the endangered or threatened species of fish or wildlife, products, items, or substances involved in the violation and relevant conduct, as applicable, have a total value of more than \$10,000.”.

Mr. ROYCE (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

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

There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONDEMNING IRAN'S PERSECUTION OF ITS BAHAI MINORITY AND CONTINUED VIOLATION OF THE INTERNATIONAL COVENANTS ON HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Affairs be discharged from further consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 220) condemning the Government of Iran's state-sponsored persecution of its Baha'i minority and its continued violation of the International Covenants on Human Rights, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 220

Whereas, in 1982, 1984, 1988, 1990, 1992, 1993, 1994, 1996, 2000, 2004, 2006, 2008, 2009, 2012, and 2013, Congress declared that it deplored the religious persecution by the Government of Iran of the Baha'i community and would hold the Government of Iran responsible for upholding the rights of all Iranian nationals, including members of the Baha'i Faith;

Whereas the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom 2014 Report stated, “The Baha'i community, the largest non-Muslim religious minority in Iran, long has been subject to particularly severe religious freedom violations. The government views Baha'is, who number at least 300,000, as ‘heretics’ and consequently they face repression on the grounds of apostasy.”;

Whereas the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom 2014 Report stated that “[s]ince 1979, authorities have killed or executed more than 200 Baha'i leaders, and more than 10,000 have been dismissed from government and university jobs” and “[m]ore than 700 Baha'is have been arbitrarily arrested since 2005”;

Whereas the Department of State 2013 International Religious Freedom Report stated that the Government of Iran “prohibits Baha'is from teaching and practicing their faith and subjects them to many forms of discrimination not faced by members of other religious groups” and “since the 1979 Islamic Revolution, formally denies Baha'i students access to higher education”;

Whereas the Department of State 2013 International Religious Freedom Report stated, “The government requires Baha'is to register with the police,” and “The government raided Baha'i homes and businesses and confiscated large amounts of private and commercial property, as well as religious materials.”;

Whereas the Department of State 2013 International Religious Freedom Report stated, “Baha'is are regularly denied compensation for injury or criminal victimization and the right to inherit property.”;

Whereas, on August 27, 2014, the United Nations Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran issued a report (A/69/356), which stated, “The human rights situation in the Islamic Republic of Iran remains of concern. Numerous issues flagged by the General Assembly, the

United Nations human rights mechanisms and the Secretary-General persist, and in some cases appear to have worsened, some recent overtures made by the Administration and the parliament notwithstanding.”;

Whereas, on December 18, 2014, the United Nations General Assembly adopted a resolution (A/RES/69/190), which “[e]xpress[ed] deep concern” over “[c]ontinued discrimination, persecution and human rights violations against persons belonging to unrecognized religious minorities, particularly members of the Baha’i [F]aith . . . and the effective criminalization of membership in the Baha’i [F]aith,” and called upon the Government of Iran to “emancipate the Baha’i community . . . and to accord all Baha’is, including those imprisoned because of their beliefs, the due process of law and the rights that they are constitutionally guaranteed”;

Whereas, since May of 2008, the Government of Iran has imprisoned the seven members of the former ad hoc leadership group of the Baha’i community in Iran, known as the Yaran-i-Iran, or “friends of Iran”—Mrs. Fariba Kamalabadi, Mr. Jamaloddin Khanjani, Mr. Afif Naeimi, Mr. Saeid Rezaie, Mr. Behrouz Tavakkoli, Mrs. Mahvash Sabet, and Mr. Vahid Tizfahm—and these individuals are serving 20-year prison terms, the longest sentences given to any current prisoner of conscience in Iran, on charges including “spying for Israel, insulting religious sanctities, propaganda against the regime and spreading corruption on earth”;

Whereas, beginning in May 2011, officials of the Government of Iran in 4 cities conducted sweeping raids on the homes of dozens of individuals associated with the Baha’i Institute for Higher Education (BIHE) and arrested and detained several educators associated with BIHE, and 12 BIHE educators are now serving 4- or 5-year prison terms;

Whereas scores of Baha’i cemeteries have been attacked, and, in April 2014, Revolutionary Guards began excavating a Baha’i cemetery in Shiraz, which is the site of 950 graves;

Whereas the Baha’i International Community reported that there has been a recent surge in anti-Baha’i hate propaganda in Iranian state-sponsored media outlets, noting that, in 2010 and 2011, approximately 22 anti-Baha’i articles were appearing every month, and, in 2014, the number of anti-Baha’i articles rose to approximately 401 per month—18 times the previous level;

Whereas there are currently 100 Baha’is in prison in Iran;

Whereas the Government of Iran is party to the International Covenants on Human Rights and is in violation of its obligations under the Covenants; and

Whereas the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (Public Law 111-195) authorizes the President and the Secretary of State to impose sanctions on individuals “responsible for or complicit in, or responsible for ordering, controlling, or otherwise directing, the commission of serious human rights abuses against citizens of Iran or their family members on or after June 12, 2009”: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) condemns the Government of Iran’s state-sponsored persecution of its Baha’i minority and its continued violation of the International Covenants on Human Rights;

(2) calls on the Government of Iran to immediately release the 7 imprisoned Baha’i leaders, the 12 imprisoned Baha’i educators, and all other prisoners held solely on account of their religion;

(3) calls on the President and Secretary of State, in cooperation with responsible nations, to immediately condemn the Govern-

ment of Iran’s continued violation of human rights and demand the immediate release of prisoners held solely on account of their religion; and

(4) urges the President and Secretary of State to utilize available authorities, including the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010, to impose sanctions on officials of the Government of Iran and other individuals directly responsible for serious human rights abuses, including abuses against the Baha’i community of Iran.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROYCE

Mr. ROYCE. I have an amendment to the text of the resolution at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike all after the resolved clause and insert the following:

That the House of Representatives—

(1) condemns the Government of Iran’s state-sponsored persecution of its Baha’i minority and its continued violation of the International Covenants on Human Rights;

(2) calls on the Government of Iran to immediately release the 7 imprisoned Baha’i leaders, the 8 imprisoned Baha’i educators, and all other prisoners held solely on account of their religion;

(3) calls on the President and Secretary of State, in cooperation with responsible nations, to immediately condemn the Government of Iran’s continued violation of human rights and demand the immediate release of prisoners held solely on account of their religion; and

(4) urges the President and Secretary of State to utilize available authorities, including the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010, to impose sanctions on officials of the Government of Iran and other individuals directly responsible for serious human rights abuses, including abuses against the Baha’i community of Iran.

Mr. ROYCE (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

AMENDMENT TO THE PREAMBLE OFFERED BY MR. ROYCE

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment to the preamble at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike the preamble and insert the following:

Whereas, in 1982, 1984, 1988, 1990, 1992, 1993, 1994, 1996, 2000, 2004, 2006, 2008, 2009, 2012, and 2013, Congress declared that it deplored the religious persecution by the Government of Iran of the Baha’i community and would hold the Government of Iran responsible for upholding the rights of all Iranian nationals, including members of the Baha’i Faith;

Whereas the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom 2014 Report stated, “The Baha’i community, the largest non-Muslim religious minority in Iran, long has been subject to particularly severe religious freedom violations. The government views Baha’is, who number at least 300,000,

as ‘heretics’ and consequently they face repression on the grounds of apostasy.”;

Whereas the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom 2014 Report stated that “[s]ince 1979, authorities have killed or executed more than 200 Baha’i leaders, and more than 10,000 have been dismissed from government and university jobs” and “[m]ore than 700 Baha’is have been arbitrarily arrested since 2005”;

Whereas the Department of State 2013 International Religious Freedom Report stated that the Government of Iran “prohibits Baha’is from teaching and practicing their faith and subjects them to many forms of discrimination not faced by members of other religious groups” and “since the 1979 Islamic Revolution, formally denies Baha’i students access to higher education”;

Whereas the Department of State 2013 International Religious Freedom Report stated, “The government requires Baha’is to register with the police,” and “The government raided Baha’i homes and businesses and confiscated large amounts of private and commercial property, as well as religious materials.”;

Whereas the Department of State 2013 International Religious Freedom Report stated, “Baha’is are regularly denied compensation for injury or criminal victimization and the right to inherit property.”;

Whereas, on August 27, 2014, the United Nations Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran issued a report (A/69/356), which stated, “The human rights situation in the Islamic Republic of Iran remains of concern. Numerous issues flagged by the General Assembly, the United Nations human rights mechanisms and the Secretary-General persist, and in some cases appear to have worsened, some recent overtures made by the Administration and the parliament notwithstanding.”;

Whereas, on December 18, 2014, the United Nations General Assembly adopted a resolution (A/RES/69/190), which “[e]xpress[ed] deep concern” over “[c]ontinued discrimination, persecution and human rights violations against persons belonging to unrecognized religious minorities, particularly members of the Baha’i [F]aith . . . and the effective criminalization of membership in the Baha’i [F]aith,” and called upon the Government of Iran to “emancipate the Baha’i community . . . and to accord all Baha’is, including those imprisoned because of their beliefs, the due process of law and the rights that they are constitutionally guaranteed”;

Whereas, since May of 2008, the Government of Iran has imprisoned the seven members of the former ad hoc leadership group of the Baha’i community in Iran, known as the Yaran-i-Iran, or “friends of Iran”—Mrs. Fariba Kamalabadi, Mr. Jamaloddin Khanjani, Mr. Afif Naeimi, Mr. Saeid Rezaie, Mr. Behrouz Tavakkoli, Mrs. Mahvash Sabet, and Mr. Vahid Tizfahm—and these individuals are serving 20-year prison terms, the longest sentences given to any current prisoner of conscience in Iran, on charges including “spying for Israel, insulting religious sanctities, propaganda against the regime and spreading corruption on earth”;

Whereas, beginning in May 2011, officials of the Government of Iran in 4 cities conducted sweeping raids on the homes of dozens of individuals associated with the Baha’i Institute for Higher Education (BIHE) and arrested and detained several educators associated with BIHE, and 8 BIHE educators are now serving 4- or 5-year prison terms;

Whereas scores of Baha’i cemeteries have been attacked, and, in April 2014, Revolutionary Guards began excavating a Baha’i cemetery in Shiraz, which is the site of 950 graves;

Whereas the Baha'i International Community reported that there has been a recent surge in anti-Baha'i hate propaganda in Iranian state-sponsored media outlets, noting that, in 2010 and 2011, approximately 22 anti-Baha'i articles were appearing every month, and, in 2014, the number of anti-Baha'i articles rose to approximately 401 per month—18 times the previous level;

Whereas there are currently 60 Baha'is in prison in Iran;

Whereas the Government of Iran is party to the International Covenants on Human Rights and is in violation of its obligations under the Covenants; and

Whereas the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (Public Law 111-195) authorizes the President and the Secretary of State to impose sanctions on individuals "responsible for or complicit in, or responsible for ordering, controlling, or otherwise directing, the commission of serious human rights abuses against citizens of Iran or their family members on or after June 12, 2009": Now, therefore, be it

Mr. ROYCE (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

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

There was no objection.

The amendment to the preamble was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GAO CIVILIAN TASK AND DELIVERY ORDER PROTEST AUTHORITY ACT OF 2016

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 5995) to strike the sunset on certain provisions relating to the authorized protest of a task or delivery order under section 4106 of title 41, United States Code, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5995

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 "GAO Civilian Task and Delivery Order Protest Authority Act of 2016".

SEC. 2. ORDERS.

Section 4106(f) of title 41, United States Code, is amended by striking paragraph (3).

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

IRANIAN LEADERSHIP ASSET TRANSPARENCY ACT

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in

which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous materials on the bill (H.R. 5461) to require the Secretary of the Treasury to submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees on the estimated total assets under direct or indirect control by certain senior Iranian leaders and other figures, and for other purposes.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 876 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. 5461.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1505

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. 5461) to require the Secretary of the Treasury to submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees on the estimated total assets under direct or indirect control by certain senior Iranian leaders and other figures, and for other purposes, with Mr. MCCLINTOCK 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 Texas (Mr. HENSARLING) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

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

Mr. Chairman, the Islamic Republic of Iran is identified as both the world's foremost state sponsor of terrorism and a country of primary money laundering concern by the United States. So the American people rightfully question the wisdom behind the Obama administration's decision to hand Iran \$1.7 billion in cash as ransom for the release of several hostages earlier this year.

There are a lot of questions the American people still have about this cash payment and a lot of questions the Obama administration has not answered, but there are at least three things that we do already know:

Number one, we know that cash is the preferred currency of terrorists;

Number two, we know the Obama administration's payment to Iran was structured in such a way that it makes it easy for Iran to move that money anywhere it wants for any purpose it wants; and

Three, we know that much of Iran's terror activity is fueled by the vast sums of personal wealth acquired by its senior political and military leaders.

Mr. Chairman, Iran's economy is characterized by high levels of official corruption and substantial involvement of its security forces, particularly the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps and that nation's business sector. Many members of Iran's senior political and military leadership have acquired significant personal and institutional wealth by using their positions to secure control over major portions of the Iranian national economy. In fact, it is estimated that Iran's top political and military leaders control one-third—one-third—of Iran's economy through personal foundations in which money from corruption is funneled.

Because of this volatile mix of terrorist financing, corruption, and wealth, it is vitally important for the United States to clearly understand the assets held by Iran's powerful military and political elite. That is the goal of this bipartisan bill that we are discussing today offered by my colleague, the gentleman from Maine (Mr. POLIQUIN).

This bill, the Iranian Leadership Asset Transparency Act, would require the Treasury Secretary to develop and post online a list estimating the funds and assets held by senior Iranian political and military leaders. Along with this estimate would be a description of how these officials acquired these assets and how these assets are being deployed. The report would be posted on the Treasury Department's Web site in English, but also translated into the three main languages used by the Iranian people so that the people of Iran may better understand the nature of their economy and how corruption is harming their fellow citizens.

Mr. Chairman, under this bill, the report would also be in a form that is easily understandable and accessible to those in the financial or business sector who might be concerned about inadvertently doing business with an Iranian entity still covered by remaining sanctions. The Iranian Government's tolerance of corruption limits realistic opportunities for foreign and domestic investment, particularly given the significant involvement of its Revolutionary Guard in many sectors of the economy. This gives the Revolutionary Guard and its leaders vast amounts of funding to support terrorism at a time when the average Iranian citizen earns about \$15,000 a year.

The report required under the Iranian Leadership Asset Transparency Act would cover about 80 individuals, including Iran's Supreme Leader, President, the 12 members of Iran's Council of Guardians, the 42 members of its Expediency Council, and roughly two dozen senior military leaders. As I mentioned, the bill requires an estimate of the funds and assets held by those individuals, not a precise amount.

Further, the proposal allows Treasury to separately furnish any sensitive information to Congress in a classified

form. Finally, the bill permits the administration to prepare the reports using a wide variety of publicly available and credible information, including commercial databases.

Developing and keeping a current estimate of the funds and assets held by top political and military leaders in Iran will also help financial institutions and private businesses comply with money laundering laws and also help them more carefully choose with whom they do business.

Just last week, the U.S. State Department said it couldn't rule out the possibility that President Obama's nuclear deal has emboldened Iran into becoming more confrontational with the United States. Indeed, as the State Department spokesman admitted last week, there are "disturbing trends" when it comes to Iran.

Since the President's cash ransom was delivered to the ayatollahs, Iran has taken more hostages, Mr. Chairman. It has stepped up its harassment of the U.S. military in the region and has started building a \$10 billion nuclear plant with the help of Russia.

Clearly, we need to know as much as we possibly can about how Iran is financing terrorism. We need to make sure financial institutions and private businesses do not inadvertently become involved in money laundering and sponsorship of terrorism.

Mr. POLIQUIN's bill has attracted bipartisan support in the Committee on Financial Services. It is common sense. Frankly, it should be on the suspension calendar. I am sorry we are having to take up time for it today. This should be common sense for all Members. It is a bill that will, again, help achieve commonsense goals as we fight financing of terrorism. I urge all Members to support the bill.

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

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 5461, the so-called Iranian Leadership Asset Transparency Act.

The administration has stated this bill would endanger our ability to ensure that Iran's nuclear program is and remains exclusively peaceful. Indeed, this harmful bill is the latest in a series of Republican efforts aimed at undermining the landmark nuclear agreement reached last year by Iran and the world's six major powers.

The comprehensive nuclear deal with Iran was intended to address one specific problem, and it has so far been a success. This success should not be underestimated, given how much a nuclear-armed Iran would magnify risk in a turbulent region in a terrible way.

Despite the fact that the nuclear deal so far has delivered on its principal goal of blocking Iran's path to nuclear weapons for an extended period of time, opponents remain committed to undermining the ongoing viability of the deal, chipping away at it piece by

piece, whether by passing legislation to block the sale of aircraft to Iran that was a central component of the agreement or accusing the administration of making extreme concessions to Iran by insisting, for example, that a legitimate legal settlement was an illegal ransom payment of some kind or by spreading rumors of suspected cheating by Iran. Republicans are intent on spreading this false narrative and dismantling the agreement.

So here we are, considering this bill, which requires the Secretary of the Treasury to report on the total estimated funds or assets under direct or indirect control of as many as 80 senior Iranian leaders, along with a description of how the funds were acquired and employed. The report would not be tied to any specific prohibition or legal action against Iran and clearly plays into the hands of critics who are seeking to gin up prospects of reputational risks for companies that might seek to do business with Iran.

Moreover, the lack of a tie to any specific prohibition or legal action against the listed individuals will likely increase confusion regarding compliance obligations rather than make remaining sanctions more easily understood.

□ 1515

Undoubtedly, the report would be seized upon by Iran as an intentional effort to discourage international investment, which Iran would view as a violation of the express U.S. commitment under the nuclear deal not to interfere with the full realization of the relief provided under the accord. The major world powers that joined us in this agreement would also likely view the legislation as bad faith.

By denying Iran the economic benefits it was promised in exchange for dismantling critical elements of this nuclear program, this bill would remove the critical incentive for Iran to hold up its end of the bargain.

As the Statement of Administration Policy notes: "If the JCPOA were to fail on that basis, it would remove the unprecedented constraints on and monitoring of Iran's nuclear program, lead to the unraveling of the international sanctions regime against Iran, and deal a devastating blow to the credibility of America's leadership and our commitment to our closest allies."

In addition to my central concern that this bill destabilizes the Iran nuclear deal, I also share the administration's concerns that producing the report that is required under this bill would divert massive resources away from investigations and the targeting of sanctions on Iran related to terrorism, human rights violations, and ballistic missiles.

Meeting the requirements of this bill would place a very real strain on the Treasury Department and intelligence community. We need to think carefully about the national security implications of diverting resources away from

the Treasury investigators who are tasked with implementing current sanctions on Iran and uncovering illicit conduct across the globe.

Proponents of this legislation have also underscored the importance of the need to show the people of Iran the corrupt practices in which their leaders are engaged. However, this bill would not accomplish that goal.

There is a profound trust gap between the United States and Iran, and any findings in this report would be met with a high degree of skepticism among the Iranian people and their leaders. Therefore, to the extent any portion of this report could actually be made public, since much of the most important facts would likely be classified anyway, it would do little to enlighten the people of Iran about their leaders. In fact, it would inevitably be rejected as United States propaganda by both the regime and by its people as a predictable attack on the country's government by the United States.

In light of the bill's limited practical utility, its failure to meet its own stated objectives, its diversion of resources away from investigations related to sanctions, and the destabilizing effects it would have on the Iran nuclear deal, I urge its opposition. Moreover, the President has announced that he would veto this bill if it came across his desk.

I include in the RECORD the Statement of Administration Policy on this bill.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY
H.R. 5461—IRANIAN LEADERSHIP ASSET
TRANSPARENCY ACT—SEPTEMBER 21, 2016

The Administration shares the Congress' goals of increasing transparency and bringing Iran into compliance with international standards in the global fight against terror finance and money laundering. However, this bill would be counterproductive toward those shared goals.

The bill requires the U.S. Government to publicly report all assets held by some of Iran's highest leaders and to describe how these assets are acquired and used. Rather than preventing terrorist financing and money laundering, this bill would incentivize those involved to make their financial dealings less transparent and create a disincentive for Iran's banking sector to demonstrate transparency. These onerous reporting requirements also would take critical resources away from the U.S. Department of the Treasury's important work to identify Iranian entities engaged in sanctionable conduct. Producing this information could also compromise intelligence sources and methods.

One of our best tools for impeding destabilizing Iranian activities has been to identify Iranian companies that are controlled by the Islamic Revolutionary Guards Corps (IRGC) or other Iranians on the list of Specially Designated Nationals and Blocked Persons (SDN List) to non-U.S. businesses, so that they can block assets or stop material transfers. This process is labor-intensive and requires the judicious use of our national intelligence assets. Redirecting these assets to preparing this onerous public report would be counterproductive and will not reduce institutional corruption or promote transparency within Iran's system.

In addition, this bill's required public postings also may be perceived by Iran and likely

our Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA) partners as an attempt to undermine the fulfillment of our commitments, in turn impacting the continued viability of this diplomatic arrangement that peacefully and verifiably prevents Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapon. If the JCPOA were to fail on that basis, it would remove the unprecedented constraints on and monitoring of Iran's nuclear program, lead to the unraveling of the international sanctions regime against Iran, and deal a devastating blow to the credibility of America's leadership and our commitments to our closest allies.

As we address our concerns with Iran's nuclear program through implementation of the JCPOA, the Administration remains clear-eyed regarding Iran's support for terrorism, its ballistic missile program, human rights abuses, and destabilizing activity in the region. The United States should retain all of the tools needed to counter this activity, ranging from powerful sanctions to our efforts to disrupt and interdict illicit shipments of weapons and proliferation-sensitive technologies. This bill would adversely affect the U.S. Government's ability to wield these tools, would undermine the very goals it purports to achieve, and could even endanger our ability to ensure that Iran's nuclear program is and remains exclusively peaceful.

If the President were presented with H.R. 5461, his senior advisors would recommend that he veto this bill.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Chair, let me end this part of my presentation by saying that the world is watching us. And for us to do anything to undermine an agreement that the President has entered into along with other major allies in the world would be devastating. And for us to do that and not understand the implications of that is beyond my ability to understand.

With the combination of Donald Trump, who they think is way out of line and crazy and does not know or understand what is going on, and these kind of actions in the Congress of the United States, who is standing up for this country? Who is supporting the President? Who is making sure that we are safe? I raise that question.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK), who is the chairman of the Terrorism Financing Task Force in our Financial Services Committee and a real leader in this area.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Chair, I thank Chairman HENSARLING for his leadership and impaneling a bipartisan task force to investigate terrorism finance, which I have chaired for the past 2 years, as we have looked into the increasing ability of terror groups to fund and to finance their actions and to evaluate the United States' response to these challenges.

Throughout the duration of this task force, several policy experts provided testimony to the Iranian regime's direct supportive groups like Hamas, Hezbollah, Iraqi Shiite militias, the Houthis in Yemen, and Syrian President Bashar al-Assad's regime in Damascus.

Prior to the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, the United States-led

sanctions regime decimated the Iranian economy, suffocating domestic industry and causing the Iranian rial to free fall. However, even during this economic duress, the regime continued to provide billions to these destabilizing groups instead of providing for its citizens.

This bill, offered by Mr. POLIQUIN of Maine, H.R. 5461, will provide the citizens of the Islamic Republic of Iran—who have suffered great economic hardship as a result of their rogue government's nefarious policies—with the transparency necessary to see how the other half lives.

This bill will make a positive advancement and change in their lives and provide the ability for them to see corruption in their economy and corruption in their government, and it will be for our security as well.

I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Chair, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. HIMES), a member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. HIMES. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to this bill, with all due respect to my friends, Mr. POLIQUIN and Mr. HILL.

The Iranian Leadership Asset Transparency Act is one of those bills that sounds like a good idea. And I am sure many of my colleagues are thinking, Why not? Transparency is a good thing. The Iranian regime is a bad thing. Let's support this thing. What could possibly go wrong?

I have a couple of points to make in that respect. The first one is that—again, with all due respect to my friends on the other side—this bill, if it is intended to get at the wealth of the Iranian leadership, will fail, and it will fail in an embarrassing and spectacular and almost laughable fashion.

The reason I say that, of course, is that the bill specifies that the estimated total funds or assets held in accounts at U.S. and foreign financial institutions shall be enumerated. Funds are defined as cash, equity, and bonds.

So if we pass this bill, we are going to know that the Supreme Leader has a thousand shares of IBM down at the local Merrill Lynch office. But European real estate, private jets, boats, piles of gold bars, stacks of unrefined heroin, Swiss watches, shell businesses in South America, we won't know about any of them.

I ask my colleagues: How many shares of IBM do you think the Iranian regime has down at the local Merrill Lynch office?

Probably not a lot. We froze their assets for a very, very long time.

This bill, if it passes, will get at some tiny fraction of the wealth of the Iranian regime in a way that will, frankly, embarrass our country because we will show how little we know, which brings me to the second problem I have with this bill.

As a member of the Intelligence Committee, I am very concerned about

what this bill would do with respect to disclosing or at least pointing at our sources and methods for intelligence gathering.

I think there are probably very few assets of the kinds captured by this bill in U.S. banks or banks that we would have ready access to in Europe, but I am not so sure there aren't perhaps cash or securities in Albanian, Pakistani, or Russian banks. If we enumerate those assets, we will be inevitably pointing at a capacity we may or may not have to determine what is going on inside those banks. I would suggest that this bill does not provide nearly enough good to put at risk the sources and methods of our intelligence gathering.

We know what is happening here. This bill is an installment in the relentless attempt by the majority to tank the Iranian nuclear bill. Look, we can disagree over whether that bill was a good idea. Certainly, we did. But the fact is—and I say this as a member of the Intelligence Committee—it is working. Iran is in compliance with their nuclear obligations.

The Prime Minister of Israel stood in the General Assembly a couple of years ago and had a little drawing of a bomb and said: We are 2 to 3 months away from breakout.

Today we are probably 12 to 15 months away from an Iranian nuclear breakout, in the worst case scenario. Yet the Republican majority, in this latest installment, wants to make that go away. Moreover, they do that without a backup plan.

If they succeed in tanking this bill and we are right back where we were a year ago, 2 to 3 months away from breakout, what then?

We are isolated. We have lost the moral high ground and we are probably a lot closer to another war in the Middle East. I don't understand that.

So think about where we wind up if the majority succeeds. We would be isolated, we would be closer to war, and we would be standing alone, clutching the moral low ground.

I ask my colleagues to think about these points, as well as the good points made by the ranking member, and to oppose this bill.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chair, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. POLIQUIN), the author of the Iranian Leadership Asset Transparency Act and a real leader in our committee and in this Congress in the fight against terrorist financing.

Mr. POLIQUIN. Mr. Chair, I thank the chairman very much for moving this very important bill through our Financial Services Committee onto the House floor. I also want to applaud my colleagues who have done so much work on this in our Terrorism Financing Task Force—of which I am a member—Democrat STEVE LYNCH from Massachusetts and Republican MIKE FITZPATRICK from Pennsylvania.

Mr. Chairman, the Iranian Government is a chief state sponsor of terrorism and instability throughout the

world. For many years, the senior political leaders and the Islamic Revolutionary Guard have trained, armed, and funded terrorist organizations. More recently, they have become experts at using the Internet and social media to recruit and teach other radical Islamic terrorists around the globe. The Iranian Government, Mr. Chair, has American blood on its hands.

The primary responsibility for every Member of Congress, Republicans and Democrats, is to support and defend our Constitution. That means keeping our families safe and keeping them free. National security, Mr. Chair, is not and should never be a political issue.

Today, about 70 to 80 top political and military leaders in Iran control approximately one-third of their economy. They use their power and their influence to corrupt the telecommunications, construction, and other important industries in that economy.

An investigation by Reuters found that the Supreme Leader alone has accumulated a tremendous amount of personal wealth through a foundation claiming to help the poor. While this corruption has grown, the average Iranian citizen earns the equivalent of about \$15,000 per year.

Mr. Chair, the people of Iran and the citizens of this world deserve to know how much the chief sponsors of terrorism in Iran have accumulated and what the money is being used for. Businesses around the world that are looking to possibly invest in Iran should know before their investment who and what they are dealing with.

Mr. Chairman, my bill, H.R. 5461, the Iranian Leadership Asset Transparency Act, is a straightforward Maine commonsense bill. It simply requires the United States Treasury Department to collect, maintain, and post online the list of 70 to 80 senior political and military leaders in Iran, their personal assets, how that money was acquired, and what it is being used for.

My bill further requires the Treasury Department to post on its Web site this information in English as well as the three main languages spoken in Iran: Farsi, Arabic, and Azeri. The information must be able to be downloaded and shared easily by everyone.

□ 1530

Mr. Chairman, sunshine is the best disinfectant. Let's use the transparency of one click of a computer from any corner of this globe to expose what the chief sponsor of terrorism in this world is doing with its money.

Americans are alarmed and frightened about the increased terror attacks here at home and in peace-loving nations around the world. Secrecy and corruption in Iran breed more terrorism, so let's shed light on this destructive behavior and put pressure on the Iranian leader to change their ways.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. POLIQUIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask all of my colleagues here in the House, Republicans and Democrats, to stand with me, and to stand with our fellow Americans, and to stand with freedom-loving people throughout the world against terrorism. I ask, please, that everyone vote "yes" for H.R. 5461, the Iranian Leadership Asset Transparency Act.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE), a leading member of the House Appropriations Committee.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the latest Republican effort to undermine the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, a historic nuclear agreement negotiated by the world's major powers to stop Iran from getting a nuclear weapon.

Since the deal was finalized, Republicans have tried time and time again to undermine not just the JCPOA but also the credibility of the President of our country, both here at home and on the international stage.

We had this very same debate right before leaving in July, when the majority refused to act on such urgent matters as Zika funding or countering gun violence. Instead, they trotted out three bills that would scuttle the Iran agreement.

Now, here we are again with two bills, one that would hinder the U.S.' ability to abide by the spirit of the deal and one that promotes a false narrative about American diplomatic activity. Predictably, both bills target President Obama and could require the U.S. to violate international accords.

As I have said before, for House Republicans the Iran nuclear agreement has become the ObamaCare of foreign policy. Republicans repeatedly proclaim it a failure, despite its objective success. They call for its immediate repeal without offering any alternative, despite the potentially disastrous consequences of such action. And they continue to clutter the Congressional calendar with so-called message votes designed to score political points instead of addressing the real issues facing our Nation—such as funding research to develop a vaccine against the Zika virus; such as funding the government for the next fiscal year and avoiding the threat of a government shutdown; or such as doing anything constructive that would ensure military readiness, strengthen our infrastructure, or make our Nation more secure.

The bill before us today, H.R. 5461, would draw a Presidential veto and would not achieve the goals the sponsor claims it would achieve.

The text of this legislation states that a new report on a select number of Iranian assets would help the Treasury Department's "efforts to prevent the financing of terrorism" and make "re-

quired compliance with remaining sanctions more easily understood."

That sounds good, but, in reality, the bill would take away critical resources used to help the Treasury identify Iranian entities engaged in sanctionable conduct—such as human rights violations, financing terrorism, and ballistic missile development—in order to make this new report.

In reality, this bill would incentivize corrupt Iranian actors to conduct their financial dealings farther and farther in the shadows. It would actually decrease transparency in Iran's banking sector, thereby undermining existing efforts to force Iran's compliance with international financial standards.

In reality, the publication of this report would promote distrust and strengthen the position of hard-liners in Iran.

These legislative antics continue, even though the opponents of the JCPOA know full well that strong sanctions on Iran remain in place.

Instead of scoring political points or seeking to deny the President a foreign policy achievement, we should be working together in a bipartisan manner to ensure the agreement's success.

Mr. Chairman, we need to remember that the world is watching what we do here today. We may think a politicized bill that has no chance of being signed into law doesn't matter much, but, in fact, to the leaders of China, Russia, or Iran, it sends a message of hesitation and disunity. And to the American public, it shows that House leadership is more interested in debating messaging bills than addressing our Nation's most pressing policy concerns.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill, forego the partisan games, and focus on the needs of Americans and the security of our Nation.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PITTENGER), vice chairman of our Task Force to Investigate Terrorism Financing.

Mr. PITTENGER. I thank the chairman for yielding the time. I also thank Congressman POLIQUIN for his leadership on this very critical issue.

Mr. Chairman, we are frequently reminded that Iran remains the world's number one state sponsor of terrorism, spreading their terrorism throughout the Middle East and throughout northern Africa.

Terrorism takes money. Training, recruiting, smuggling weapons, supporting sleeper cells, all of these are business activities of terrorist organizations which require major funding.

For Iran, much of the funding comes when Iran's small network of tyrannical leaders pilfer Iran's economy. Iran's top political and military leaders control roughly one-third of Iran's economy, including large portions of the telecommunications, construction, airport, and seaport sectors. This cozy arrangement provides Iran's radical Islamic leaders with significant cash to export terror and evil, while leaving

Iran's citizens to suffer the effects of a depleted economy.

The Iranian Leadership Asset Transparency Act will shine a bright light on the rampant corruption and the self-serving behavior of the Iranian mullahs. Through this report, we hope to make international corporations aware of how their dealings with Iran are supporting terrorism and barbaric evil and to help the Iranian people fully understand how their supposed leaders are not operating in their best interests.

Through this report, the American people will also better understand why President Obama's \$1.7 billion ransom payment to Iran is likely to be used, again, to support terrorism and why President Obama's unyielding commitment to negotiate with Iran's corrupt leaders will ultimately make America and the world less safe.

Iran is the new evil empire, a corrupt regime intent on spreading nefarious actions, destroying freedom, human rights, and free speech throughout the world. They exist by sucking dry the very people they claim to serve.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 5461, the Iranian Leadership Asset Transparency Act.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, (Mr. ROTHFUS).

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the Iranian Leadership Asset Transparency Act. While everyday Iranians earn around \$15,000 a year, corruption pervades the highest levels of the Iranian Government, where bad actors use their wealth and positions of power to fund terrorism and to advance their own interests. The wealthiest and most powerful of the Iranian elites, including members of the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps, and the foundations they run control an estimated one-third of the nation's total economy.

While President Obama and his administration have engaged in negotiations with Iran's leadership under the delusional pretext that they are in any way trustworthy or honorable, we know better. The Iranian Ayatollah's favored slogan, "Death to America," should have tipped the administration off that Iran is our adversary, not a peace-loving ally.

President Obama's foreign policy with respect to Iran has set America back, endangering us and our allies. And with the implementation of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, he has funneled billions of dollars to the world's leading state sponsor of terror. Indeed, Iran funds Hezbollah, which was responsible for more American deaths than any other terrorist organization prior to September 11, 2001.

This legislation is among several key efforts the House is making to mitigate the damage the Obama administration

has already done by providing Iran with billions of dollars in sanctions relief and cash payments.

Requiring increased transparency regarding the funds that Iran's leaders hold, many of whom are engaged in sinister activities, will help financial institutions and private businesses comply with money laundering, related laws, and more carefully decide with whom they do business.

Mr. Chairman, to a large degree, holding corrupt Iranian leaders more accountable is a matter of life and death for Americans and our allies. Iran has made its evil intentions toward America clear, and its leaders are intent upon harming us. I strongly urge this House to pass this crucial legislation.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, we have received any number of letters and correspondence in opposition to this bill, but I thought it would be important to just share with you one such communication from J Street, which is an Israel lobbying group. They basically say that:

"... in light of its limited practical utility—this bill appears to be yet another piece of a sustained effort by US opponents of the JCPOA and other diplomatic engagement with Iran to undermine the agreement by weakening the domestic standing of Iranian President Hassan Rouhani and his allies vis-a-vis Iranian hardliners who also oppose the agreement and bilateral dialogue. It is likely not a coincidence that proponents have arranged for floor consideration of this bill just as Rouhani is in the United States for the United Nations General Assembly, and that it would require the finalization of the first report around the time of the next Iranian Presidential election.

"Hindering the US Government's ability to enforce the terms of the JCPOA and sanctions on Iran's dangerous non-nuclear behavior while simultaneously undermining Rouhani's standing would make America and our allies less safe and rebound to the benefit of the very Iranian hardliners who seek to do us harm. Risking these consequences for the sake of procuring information that could not be shared with its intended audience would be both pointless and reckless. We therefore urge Members of Congress to oppose this bill."

That is from J Street, the Israel lobbying group.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WILLIAMS).

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, here are the facts: This summer, Congress was made aware that \$400 million worth of cash was secretly airlifted to Iran. Two days later, an additional \$1.3 billion was sent to Iran. This comes on top of the approximately \$55 billion Iran had access to after the Iran nuclear deal was reached.

But here is something that Americans do not know: Where is all the money going and why? Is it going to help Iran rebuild its badly aging infrastructure? Is it going to support expanding freedoms for the average Iranian, or improving basic living conditions? Who believes any of that?

In June of this year, Secretary Kerry admitted: Some of the money would go to groups labeled as terrorist organizations.

He then said: The rest of it, well, we just don't know.

I am proud to rise today in support of my friend from Maine's bill, a bill that will provide some transparency by requiring the Department of the Treasury to develop and post online a list that estimates the amount of funds and assets held by senior Iranian and military leaders and how they acquired those assets.

As a member of the Task Force to Investigate Terrorism Financing, our committee learned firsthand the dangers associated with approving the Iran nuclear deal and giving them access to large amounts of cash. Frankly, Iran's leaders cannot be trusted. They are our enemy.

Again, Mr. Chairman, the investment made by all U.S. taxpayers in Iran was very costly. Let's make sure we hold their leaders accountable. Please support the bill.

In God we trust.

□ 1545

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HECK), a member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. HECK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to this bill because, well, it is a distraction. It is a distraction not just from the work we should be doing—I mean, I would ask more than rhetorically exactly how many babies have to be born with microcephaly before we actually get serious about dealing with that proposed issue and the menace that it threatens America with. Frankly, this bill is meant to be a distraction from the fact that when it actually mattered, the Financial Services Committee was absent from the debate over the Iran deal—MIA.

In May 2015, we passed the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act to provide a framework to consider the Iran deal, which we all know now is known as JCPOA. Frankly, as one Member—I know a lot of others spent a lot of time thinking about that issue and that vote, and I, frankly, would suggest that Members on both sides of the aisle gave this a considerable amount of consideration, but we didn't learn anything about it from the Financial Services Committee—zero, zip, nada.

One would think that if the committee were so concerned about JCPOA, they would have explored these issues in detail while the deal

was still under consideration, just as many other committees did.

In fact, I counted more than 30 Iran-related hearings in the House of Representatives between June 2014 and June 2016, including 9 in the 2-month review period mandated in the REVIEW Act. In that full 2 years, Financial Services had no Iran hearings in full committee or subcommittee—zip, zero, nada. All we got was one solitary hearing and a working group before the deal went into effect.

It is not just hearings where Financial Services was MIA. Since I have arrived in Congress, we have passed at least four bills dealing with financial sanctions or terrorism finance where the chair agreed in writing to waive jurisdiction with an exchange of letters. On two additional bills, the leadership brought to the floor without the chairman's seeking to protect the committee's jurisdiction over this critical issue.

So I would just ask, Mr. Chairman, if this issue were so important—and it is—where was the Financial Services Committee while the JCPOA was being debated? It was MIA. It was absent. Then, after sitting silent while the pivotal deal was being developed, considered, and debated, the committee has finally sprung to life to attempt to sabotage a deal that didn't fall apart, frankly, as a lot of the proponents of this deal would have liked.

The IAEA has stated clearly, for months, that Iran is compliant with its nuclear-related obligations under JCPOA, but we are only now bringing to the floor legislation that undermines our own commitments to the JCPOA.

Sadly, it is clear that the bill we have on the floor today is about politics. It is a distraction, and we should reject it.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HILL).

Mr. HILL. I thank the chairman of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 5461 today, and I am a proud original cosponsor of this legislation.

Mr. POLIQUIN's approach is simply a commonsense thing to do. When you consider that this administration, 6 years ago, turned its back on the Iranian people when they were trying to protest their notorious regime and take to the streets, but then instead of aiding those citizens, they turned their back on the people of Iran to negotiate with the ayatollahs what I believe to be an ill-conceived and poorly designed nuclear deal.

My friend from Connecticut (Mr. HIMES) makes the point of asset transparency and argues that this bill would not, in fact, help advance the transparency of the Quds Force or the aggregation of these assets in the hands of these 80 individuals. But, in fact, if the administration was serious about transparency, they would not give the

largest state sponsor of terrorism \$1.7 billion in Swiss francs and euros to become an untraceable honey pot for the purchase of ballistic missile components or fund terrorism in the West Bank or back Assad.

Representative PRICE of North Carolina talks about this act actually strengthening the hard-liners. I would argue, if this is strengthening the hardliners, what, in fact, did the JCPOA accomplish when we report a 50 percent increase in incursions from the Iranian military in our air and sea activities in the Persian Gulf?

The hard-liners in Iran called the payment of \$1.7 billion a ransom—not the people of the United States. In fact, they have taken two more additional hostages as a result of this administration's process.

If we are not strengthening the hard-liners, then why is Iran doubling down on acquiring ballistic missile technology and backing the absolute destruction of Syria?

So, Mr. Chairman, I think this is a commonsense measure that will let the people of Iran see what the 80 powerful individuals are doing with the billions that have been freed up to come back to the people, to the country of Iran.

Street paving is not going on, Mr. Chairman. What is going on is the expansion of terrorism and billions in untraceable money backing a regime that our own State Department and Treasury says is undiminished in their sponsor of terrorism worldwide.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support Mr. POLIQUIN's commonsense bill.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS), a member of the Financial Services and Foreign Affairs Committees.

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Chairman, let me see. Let's look at this bill.

H.R. 5461 would require the Secretary of the Treasury to submit a report to Congress on the estimated total assets under the direct or indirect control by Iranian leaders and certain senior political and other figures regardless of whether such individuals are subject to U.S. sanctions.

So what will that do? By creating this report, it would place a substantial time and human resource burden on the Treasury and, in fact, divert critical energy and resources away from targeting sanctionable conduct and compliance over existing sanctions tied to human rights, terrorism, and ballistic missiles.

Moreover, since the report would not be tied to any prohibition or legal action, it would have little use as a compliance tool and, in fact, would likely confuse the Office of Foreign Assets Control's regulated publicly.

Finally, such a report would undoubtedly be seized upon by Iran—and quite possibly by all of our P5 allies—as an intended effort to discourage international investment in Iran,

which, in turn, could be viewed as a violation of the expressed U.S. commitment under the JCPOA to prevent interference with the realization of the full benefit by Iran of the JCPOA and, therefore, undermine the continued support for the JCPOA with Iran.

So I know some people on the other side of the aisle don't believe that this is the right thing, but it is clear JCPOA prevents an armed nuclear Iran. We should vote against H.R. 5461.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TIPTON).

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Chairman, it has recently come to light that this administration may have sent the world's leading state sponsor of terrorism as much as \$33 billion in cash and gold payments over the last 2 years.

American lives have been lost because of Iran's state-sponsored terrorism; families have been ripped apart. Yet, just last month, we learned that the administration paid Iran \$1.7 billion—400 million of which was in unmarked, non-U.S. currency—before they could secure the release of American military personnel held hostage in Iran. There is no way to track how Iran is using this money—or any of the rest of the billions in payments it has received.

If this administration will not act to keep its citizens safe, then the House must force its hand. This starts by holding both our administration and Iran's government accountable. We are expressly prohibiting any future ransom payments to Iran, and we are requiring the Treasury to publicize any assets associated with members of Iran's government leadership. We are also requiring the Treasury to submit a report to Congress that shows how the assets were acquired and how they have been put to use.

Fighting terrorism should not be a partisan issue. Depriving evil regimes of the ability to fund terrorism should not be a partisan issue. Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the two pieces of legislation that we have on the House side, on the Republican column. Mr. POLIQUIN's bill, H.R. 5461, is a step in the right direction, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how much time remains?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas has 7½ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from California has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT).

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Chairman, can I bring a slightly different discussion and weave it back into the things that have been said here?

Mechanically, we often have this conversation that if we had a more holistic understanding of the money that was going to bad actors around the world—

I am holding parts of the report here talking about 18 tons of cocaine being moved through north Africa and then, ultimately, through Lebanon, through the handlers of Hezbollah and a billion-plus dollars of cash. As you and I know, we have all sat through the terrorism financing testimony and others that Hezbollah doesn't move, ultimately, without their puppet masters in Iran instructing them on what to do.

So take a step backwards. If I came to you and said I care about terrorism, I care about bad actors, I care about drug resources moving through the world, and I have the country of Iran whose proxies are functionally, today, the leading money launderers not only in the region, but probably the world, and then we look at what the administration has done—I understand many people support it for the nuclear arms side. I am fine. I am enraged that the openness and the misrepresentation and lying—just plain lying—to Congress on the timing, what happened, and how it was delivered—was it in cash, or was it in wires? So a piece of legislation like this, why would we fear another layer of just openness and disclosure saying that this is woven into many evil, bad actors in the world that are moving billions of dollars of illicit money and illicit narcotics, people—human smuggling—why wouldn't we want to sort of have the view of what is Iran's hand in it, what is their proxy's hand in it we call Hezbollah?

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Chairman, many of us have sat on the terrorism finance committee, and I appreciate Chairman HENSARLING for allowing me to sit there. But the more you learn, the more you understand the levels of complication. We have this habit around here, when we get behind the microphones, we make things direct and simple in a sound bite. It is complex, and there are tremendous amounts of money and bad things happening here.

Why would a simple piece of legislation—one of the beautiful things in here is it gives me more openness so we understand what the bad actors are doing.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, as I have said at the onset of this debate, it is clear that this bill is nothing more than an effort to derail the administration's diplomatic accomplishments with regard to the Iran nuclear deal.

□ 1600

After failing to block the deal from being implemented, opponents have shifted their focus towards unraveling and delegitimizing it bit by bit. This is despite the fact that over a year after the accord was signed, the JCPOA is

widely seen as having diffused the global security threat of a nuclear armed Iran for at least a generation.

Despite the ongoing success of the agreement, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have gone to great lengths to promote a false narrative that the administration too readily concedes to Iran's demands, including by pushing claims that the U.S. made secret ransom payments to Iran. Other efforts to destabilize the agreement have been aimed squarely at violating the terms of the agreement itself.

For example, Republicans moved a spate of measures earlier this summer that would block the sale of aircraft to Iran, despite the fact that these sales were a central component of the nuclear agreement. Moreover, Republicans also rushed legislation to the floor before leaving for the last congressional recess to undermine Iran's conduct of banking transactions outside of the United States—activity that became permissible as part of the nuclear deal.

So while the bill before us today, H.R. 5461, may appear to contain a simple reporting requirement, it is most certainly not a bill that promotes our national security interests. By requiring an extraneous report on the assets of Iranian leaders without regard to current sanctions or other obligations, the bill would prevent the Iranian people from receiving the full benefits of this agreement. This would put the agreement in jeopardy and strengthen the hand of the hardliners in Iran who want nothing more than to see the nuclear deal fall apart. This scenario would threaten global security and deal a severe blow in our efforts to prevent a nuclear Iran.

In closing, I would like to ask critics of the deal what they believe their moral responsibility will be if their relentless efforts to undo the deal are successful? How do you think rejection by the U.S. of the nuclear deal will affect American leadership on any future foreign policy negotiations?

Some critics of the Iran nuclear deal express outrage that the deal has not curtailed Iran's other destabilizing influence in the region or support for what they say is terrorism at this time.

I think it is important to note that the Iran nuclear deal was quite deliberately focused on the nuclear issue as the paramount concern regarding Iran's foreign policy. The Iran nuclear deal is an arms control agreement, and in that respect, it has been successful to date.

It is my hope that the ongoing success of the nuclear deal might give us the leverage to work toward constructing a better policy towards Iran that will help us address the range of Iran's destabilizing behavior in the region, but I urge my colleagues not to confuse the legislation like H.R. 5461 with any serious effort to move us in that direction. So rather than force the President to veto this harmful and mis-

guided legislation, I urge my colleagues to block this bill from moving forward here in the House.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to reiterate that the world is watching what we do here. I want to reiterate that we didn't just enter into this deal by ourselves. We have all of our allies who have agreed to this deal. If this is undermined, if it is seen to cause us to act in bad faith, then what are we to say to our allies? What are we to say to the rest of the world about a deal that was negotiated by the leader of this country, the President of the United States?

If the President of the United States of America can't count on the Congress of the United States to back him up in the world, if the President of the United States can't count on the Members of Congress to stand with him, and if the President of the United States can't be comfortable that the Members of Congress are not going to make him look as if he did not mean what he said, that he was not truthful in the negotiation, then what can a leader do? How can a leader lead a country?

All of us who claim to love this country and to care about its safety and security have ourselves on the line with this legislation. This is legislation that will be deemed to undermine that agreement and be seen as just another attempt to undermine the President of the United States of America. It is not concerned about whether or not we have stopped the nuclear proliferation in Iran, not concerned that we have caused all of that region to feel safe and us to feel safe for another generation, but rather, pursuing to undermine the agreement simply because they don't like some part of it or they are not able to make the President do what they want him to do.

This is outrageous. This cannot go forward in the way that it is intended by my friends on the opposite side of the aisle. I know that they are smart and they are bright and they are intelligent, but they cannot let their emotions about either not liking the President of the United States or simply not liking Iran to get in the way of this deal that will create safety in the world.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I cannot imagine what the American people who are tuning in to C-SPAN must think. They must think that when they hear our friends on the other side of the aisle, that they have tuned in not to the United States Congress, but to the Iranian Parliament.

Rarely have I heard so many come to the House floor to defend this regime. Oh, oh, we might hurt their feelings if we make them disclose their personal finances.

Mr. Chairman, every Member of Congress has to disclose their personal finances. So what is wrong with the foremost state sponsor of terrorism exposing their assets, their funding, where

they control one-third of the Iranian economy?

No. We hear: Oh, we might hurt their feelings, we may hurt their sensibilities.

Now, many have come to quote the administration. Well, Mr. Chairman, let me quote the administration—the State Department’s Country Reports on Terrorism. The last one noted that:

“Iran continued to sponsor terrorist groups around the world, principally through its Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps. . . . These groups included Lebanese Hizballah, several Iraqi Shia militant groups, Hamas, and Palestine Islamic Jihad. Iran, Hizballah, and other Shia militia continued to provide support to the Asad regime, dramatically bolstering its capabilities, prolonging the civil war in Syria, and worsening the human rights and refugee crisis there.”

Mr. Chairman, those aren’t my words. Those are the words of the President’s State Department. Now, this is their country report.

Maybe, maybe my colleagues on the other side of the aisle would like to offer an amendment so that no longer can the State Department publish such reports on terrorism because it might offend the sensibilities of the Iranians.

The truth is, Mr. Chairman, this is a total red herring. There is nothing, nothing in this bill that violates the JCPOA. I think it is a terrible agreement. This is well known. In fact, a strong majority of this body opposed it, but we understand the President entered into it.

How can they object? How can my friends on the other side of the aisle object to transparency and accountability for the leadership of the world’s foremost state sponsor of terrorism—again, that is the Obama administration saying that, Mr. Chairman—how can they object to a little transparency there and yet allow this report to come out from the State Department?

It makes no sense at all. We heard some say: Oh, my Lord, this might take up resources at the State Department.

Well, according to the Congressional Budget Office, this comes in in thousands. Not millions, not billions, not trillions, but thousands. And given that the most important thing we do as Members of Congress is to provide for the common defense, including the common defense against the world’s foremost state sponsor of terrorism, I think that it would be wise that we put the resources towards this report. It may be a first because I have never heard, in the years I have been here, any of my Democratic colleagues ever be concerned about the resources of the United States of America, as they have worked to give us the worst debt and deficit in the history of our Republic, an unsustainable debt that undermines our common defense.

Again, Mr. Chairman, this is a regime involved in cyberterrorism. This is a regime trying to develop ballistic

missile technology. This is a regime that funds Hezbollah as it rains missiles down on Israel.

The gentleman from Maine (Mr. POLIQUIN) has come up with a very commonsense piece of legislation. I applaud his leadership in bringing forth H.R. 5461. Let’s have some transparency, let’s have some accountability. We know—we know that to combat terrorist financing. We must follow the money. We must expose the money. And that is what the gentleman from Maine does with his bill.

I do not understand why such a commonsense piece of legislation is being so vigorously opposed by my friends on the other side of the aisle. Again, Americans must be in a tizzy trying to figure out if they have tuned in to the United States Congress or the Iranian Parliament. Let’s make sure they understand this is the United States Congress. We will stand for the common defense, we will expose this terrorist financing, and we will stand with the gentleman from Maine (Mr. POLIQUIN) and stand for all Americans, and we will vote for H.R. 5461.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chair, I rise today to support H.R. 5461, the “Iranian Leadership Transparency Act,” introduced by my colleague BRUCE POLIQUIN.

This bill will give the Iranian people some measure of the transparency they deserve—but have long been denied—about the corrupt financial dealings of their government. H.R. 5461 would require the Administration to produce an annual report on the financial and other assets owned by Iran’s senior leaders and the highest ranks of Iran’s Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps.

The report will be published in an easily downloadable format in English, Farsi, Arabic, and Azeri to make sure the information winds up in the hands of Iranians and empowers transparency advocates.

With a corruption index ranking of 130 out of 168 countries from Transparency International and a media freedom ranking of 169 out of 180 from Reporters Without Borders, Iran is one of the most difficult climates in which to discover and report the truth about official corruption.

This United States Government report would provide unique insights for Iranian and international audiences, particularly since so much of Iran’s economy is controlled by shadowy organizations, such as the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps. The United States Institute of Peace assesses that the IRGC is Iran’s single largest economic force with major stakes in most sectors of the economy, including construction, energy, and telecommunication, among others.

To further draw back the curtain on Iran’s shadowy dealings, the report would detail how the IRGC and Iranian leaders acquired these assets, how they use them, and any methods or techniques they have employed to launder them.

Mr. Chair, the report will also enable us to whether the Administration is doing everything in its power to curtail Iran’s well-known money laundering practices—which serve as the conduit for much of the support Iran provides to the terrorist groups and armed proxies that

threaten American and Israeli lives on a daily basis.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

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

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5461

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 “Iranian Leadership Asset Transparency Act”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds the following:

(1) Iran is characterized by high levels of official and institutional corruption, and substantial involvement by Iran’s security forces, particularly the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps (IRGC), in the economy.

(2) Many members of Iran’s senior political and military leadership have acquired significant personal and institutional wealth by using their positions to secure control of significant portions of Iran’s national economy.

(3) Sanctions relief provided through the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action has resulted in the removal of many Iranian entities that are tied to governmental corruption from the list of entities sanctioned by the United States.

(4) The Department of Treasury in 2011 designated the Islamic Republic of Iran’s financial sector as a jurisdiction of primary money laundering concern under section 311 of the USA PATRIOT Act, stating “Treasury has for the first time identified the entire Iranian financial sector; including Iran’s Central Bank, private Iranian banks, and branches, and subsidiaries of Iranian banks operating outside of Iran as posing illicit finance risks for the global financial system.”.

(5) Iran continues to be listed by the Financial Action Task Force (FATF) among the “Non-Cooperative Countries or Territories”—countries which it perceived to be non-cooperative in the global fight against terror finance and money laundering.

(6) Iran and North Korea are the only countries listed by the FATF as “Non-Cooperative Countries or Territories” against which FATF countries should take measures.

(7) The Transparency International index of perceived public corruption ranks Iran 130th out of 168 countries surveyed.

(8) The State Department identified Iran as a country/jurisdiction of “primary concern” for money laundering in its 2014 International Narcotics Control Strategy Report (INCSR).

(9) The State Department currently identifies Iran, along with Sudan and Syria, as a state sponsor of terrorism, “having repeatedly provided support for acts of international terrorism”.

(10) The State Department’s “Country Reports on Terrorism”, published last in June 2015 noted that “Iran continued to sponsor terrorist groups around the world, principally through its Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps—Qods Force (IRGC-QF). These groups included Lebanese Hizballah, several Iraqi Shia militant groups, Hamas, and Palestine Islamic Jihad. Iran, Hizballah, and other Shia militia continued to provide support to the Asad regime, dramatically bolstering its capabilities, prolonging the civil war in Syria, and worsening the human rights and refugee crisis there.”.

(11) The Iranian Government’s tolerance of corruption and nepotism in business limits

opportunities for foreign and domestic investment, particularly given the significant involvement of the IRGC in many sectors of Iran's economy.

(12) The IRGC and the leadership-controlled bonyads (foundations) control an estimated one-third of Iran's total economy, including large portions of Iran's telecommunications, construction, and airport and port operations. These operations give the IRGC and bonyads vast funds to support terrorist organizations such as Hezbollah and Hamas.

(13) By gaining control of major economic sectors, the IRGC and bonyads have also served to further disadvantage the average Iranian.

SEC. 3. REPORT REQUIREMENT RELATING TO ASSETS OF IRANIAN LEADERS AND CERTAIN SENIOR POLITICAL FIGURES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 270 days after the date of enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter (or more frequently if the Secretary of the Treasury determines it appropriate based on new information received by the Secretary) for the following 2 years, the Secretary of the Treasury shall, in furtherance of the Secretary's efforts to prevent the financing of terrorism, money laundering, or related illicit finance and to make financial institutions' required compliance with remaining sanctions more easily understood, submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees containing—

(1) the estimated total funds or assets held in accounts at U.S. and foreign financial institutions that are under direct or indirect control by each natural person described in subsection (b) and a description of such assets;

(2) an identification of any equity stake such natural person has in an entity on the Department of the Treasury's list of Specially Designated Nationals or in any other sanctioned entity;

(3) a description of how such funds or assets or equity interests were acquired, and how they have been used or employed; and

(4) a description of any new methods or techniques used to evade anti-money laundering and related laws, including recommendations to improve techniques to combat illicit uses of the U.S. financial system by each natural person described in subsection (b).

(b) PERSONS DESCRIBED.—The natural persons described in this subsection are the following:

- (1) The Supreme Leader of Iran.
- (2) The President of Iran.
- (3) Members of the Council of Guardians.
- (4) Members of the Expediency Council.
- (5) The Minister of Intelligence and Security.
- (6) The Commander and the Deputy Commander of the IRGC.
- (7) The Commander and the Deputy Commander of the IRGC Ground Forces.
- (8) The Commander and the Deputy Commander of the IRGC Aerospace Force.
- (9) The Commander and the Deputy Commander of the IRGC Navy.
- (10) The Commander of the Basij-e Mostaz'afin.
- (11) The Commander of the Qods Force.
- (12) The Commander in Chief of the Police Force.
- (13) The head of the IRGC Joint Staff.
- (14) The Commander of the IRGC Intelligence.
- (15) The head of the IRGC Imam Hussein University.
- (16) The Supreme Leader's Representative at the IRGC.
- (17) The Chief Executive Officer and the Chairman of the IRGC Cooperative Foundation.

(18) The Commander of the Khatam-al-Anbia Construction Head Quarter.

(19) The Chief Executive Officer of the Basij Cooperative Foundation.

(20) The head of the Political Bureau of the IRGC.

(c) FORM OF REPORT; PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—

(1) FORM.—The report required under subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form but may contain a classified annex.

(2) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The unclassified portion of such report shall be made available to the public and posted on the website of the Department of the Treasury—

(A) in English, Farsi, Arabic, and Azeri; and

(B) in precompressed, easily downloadable versions that are made available in all appropriate formats.

(d) SOURCES OF INFORMATION.—In preparing a report described under subsection (a), the Secretary of the Treasury may utilize any credible publication, database, web-based resource, and any credible information compiled by any government agency, nongovernmental organization, or other entity provided to or made available to the Secretary.

(e) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section:

(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term "appropriate congressional committees" means the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate.

(2) FUNDS.—The term "funds" means—

- (A) cash;
- (B) equity;
- (C) any other intangible asset whose value is derived from a contractual claim, including bank deposits, bonds, stocks, a security as defined in section 2(a) of the Securities Act of 1933 (15 U.S.C. 77b(a)), or a security or an equity security as defined in section 3(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78c(a)); and
- (D) anything else that the Secretary determines appropriate.

The CHAIR. No amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in House Report 114-778. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, 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.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. POLIQUIN

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 114-778.

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 9, line 23, strike "Committee on Financial Services" and insert "Committees on Financial Services and Foreign Affairs".

Page 9, line 24, strike "Committee" and insert "Committees".

Page 10, line 1, after "Affairs" insert the following: "and Foreign Relations".

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 876, the gentleman from Maine (Mr. POLIQUIN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. POLIQUIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer the Poliquin amendment to the Iranian Leadership Asset Transparency Act.

My amendment is very simple, Mr. Chairman. It adds the Committee on Foreign Affairs to the reporting requirements in the bill.

Right now, the legislation requires the Department of Treasury to provide a report to the House Financial Services Committee and the Senate Banking Committee, the unclassified portion of which will be posted for everyone to see on the U.S. Department of Treasury's Web site. My amendment, Mr. Chairman, adds the House Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Foreign Relations in the Senate as appropriate congressional committees to receive the report.

It is a small adjustment to the bill, but a good one, as I think we all benefit from the good work that Chairman ROYCE and his committee has conducted with regard to the Iranian regime.

I urge support of this amendment and, once again, for the underlying bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maine (Mr. POLIQUIN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF INDIANA

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. SIMPSON). It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 114-778.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. 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 7, line 7, strike "and".

Page 7, line 13, strike the period and insert a semicolon.

Page 7, after line 13, insert the following:

(5) recommendations for how U.S. economic sanctions against Iran may be revised to prevent the funds or assets described under this subsection from being used by the natural persons described in subsection (b) to contribute to the continued development, testing, and procurement of ballistic missile technology by Iran;

(6) a description of how the Department of the Treasury assesses the impact and effectiveness of U.S. economic sanctions programs against Iran; and

(7) recommendations for improving the ability of the Department of the Treasury to rapidly and effectively develop, implement, and enforce additional economic sanctions against Iran if so ordered by the President under the International Emergency Economic Powers Act or other corresponding legislation.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 876, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana.

□ 1615

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my amendment to the Iranian Leadership Asset Transparency Act.

I thank the gentleman from Maine (Mr. POLIQUIN) for his timely and valuable bill.

Iran is a determined and treacherous enemy of the United States. Despite the hopes of the Obama administration's following the adoption of the JCPOA nuclear agreement, Iran has only escalated its aggressive foreign policy over the past year. It has not locked arms agreeably with the community of civilized nations.

While the Obama administration removed the sanctions related to Iran's nuclear program following the adoption of the JCPOA, U.S. sanctions remain in place against Iran in response to its state sponsorship of terrorism, ballistic missile program, and human rights violations.

Tracking and cataloging the assets and funds that are controlled by the Iranian regime is a necessary step towards uncovering how Iran continues to challenge and attempts to circumvent the U.S. sanctions regime.

My amendment simply builds upon the excellent foundation laid out in the underlying bill by expanding the scope of the reporting requirements. These new components require Treasury to provide recommendations for improving the U.S. sanctions regime against Iran and a description of how Treasury assesses the impact and effectiveness of U.S. sanctions.

The amendment will enhance the ability of Congress to assess and exercise oversight over Iran policy. The expanding reporting requirements will also contribute to the ability of Congress to ensure that Iran policy is serving the national security interests of the United States.

Iran's continued aggression threatens all Americans regardless of one's political party. It is not partisan maneuvering for Congress to require the Department of the Treasury to provide valuable information to Congress on matters of great importance to our national security.

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

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Chairman, the Young amendment would add three additional requirements to the report that are called for under the underlying bill, including a description of how the administration views the effectiveness of its sanctions programs and recommendations for improving their enforcement.

I believe it would be a strategic mistake to disclose to our adversaries how we view the effectiveness of our sanctions programs and would be imprudent to signal to them how we might

respond or alter our approach through the use of economic sanctions.

Furthermore, the amendment appears to be premised on the assumption that the administration isn't already actively enforcing sanctions related to Iran, particularly its pursuit of ballistic missile technology. Ironically, the extensive reporting requirements on roughly 80 senior Iranian officers in the underlying bill would detract from the administration's ability to implement the very sanctions that the Young amendment seeks to embrace.

Given its false premise, the increased burden the amendment would place on the Treasury Department, and the strategic folly of revealing our strategy for using sanctions to rein in Iran's nefarious behavior, I oppose the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I simply don't believe that these Members who are engaging in this kind of activity really understand what they are doing. I refer to it as folly, but it is worse than that. It is weighing in on something they really don't know about. In doing so, they don't recognize the damage they are doing to their own country and to the President of the United States. I oppose this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time. The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. LANCE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 114-778.

Mr. LANCE. 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 8, after line 23, insert the following:
(21) The head of the Atomic Energy Organization of Iran.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 876, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LANCE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. LANCE. My thanks to Chairman HENSARLING, and my thanks, as well, to Congressman POLIQUIN for their tremendous leadership on this issue.

Mr. Chairman, this is not about the underlying Iranian nuclear agreement, and nothing in this amendment and nothing in the Poliquin bill will change that agreement. Obviously, there is significant debate about the underlying agreement. I am a strong opponent of that, as was the majority here in the House of Representatives. Unfortunately, the other Chamber never voted on the issue because we could not reach a conclusion of debate on that issue.

On this amendment, it is in our national security interest to be scrutinizing the assets that are held by senior Iranian political and military leaders so that we might know how those

assets were acquired and how they are being spent. This amendment would add the name of the head of the Iranian Atomic Energy Organization, a position currently held by Ali Akbar Salehi, to a list of Iranian leaders who are named in this legislation.

Given Iran's known desire for a nuclear weapons program and its clear ties to international terror, we should be monitoring the finances of the head of its nuclear program regardless of who he is. For years, the Iranian regime has been mired in institutionalized corruption; and the nexus of nuclear weapons, state-sponsored terrorism, money laundering, secret financial agreements, and mass pilfering from the Iranian people is cause for great alarm.

Mr. Chairman, we need all of the tools at our disposal. Let's add the head of the Atomic Energy Organization of Iran to this legislation, and let's have the U.S. Treasury do all it can to investigate the finances of this regime.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a "yes" vote on the amendment I am offering, and I certainly urge a "yes" vote on the underlying legislation that has been sponsored by Congressman POLIQUIN.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Chairman, I really should not spend my time on this. This is kind of ridiculous that this long list we have of which they want to find out about the assets—where they came from, how they are managed, who they give them to, et cetera—is kind of senseless anyway because, even if the Treasury Department took all of this time and effort that it should be using on enforcing sanctions, et cetera, it would be classified. I don't know how they expect to get this to the Iranian people to view as they are trying to have them think that they can somehow undermine what their government is doing and, I guess, create a war between Iran and the United States.

I don't know what they are doing, but I know this—it doesn't make good sense. It ties up the Treasury Department to do all of this useless stuff. And to have a list where you spend time on the floor of the United States Congress saying, I want to add one more name—give me a break. I oppose the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, 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. LANCE).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. There being no further amendment, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CHABOT) having assumed the chair, Mr.

SIMPSON, 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. 5461) to require the Secretary of the Treasury to submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees on the estimated total assets under direct or indirect control by certain senior Iranian leaders and other figures, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 876, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments 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 reported from the Committee of the Whole? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were 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.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5931, PROHIBITING FUTURE RANSOM PAYMENTS TO IRAN ACT, AND WAIVING A REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(a) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS REPORTED FROM THE COMMITTEE ON RULES

Ms. FOXX, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 114-781) on the resolution (H. Res. 879) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5931) to provide for the prohibition on cash payments to the Government of Iran, and for other purposes, and waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REQUIRE EVALUATION BEFORE IMPLEMENTING EXECUTIVE WISHLISTS ACT OF 2016

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous materials on H.R. 3438.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 875 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. 3438.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1627

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. 3438) to amend title 5, United States Code, to postpone the effective date of high-impact rules pending judicial review, with Mr. SIMPSON 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 Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

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

Washington's regulatory system is one that virtually every day places new obstacles in the path of American jobs and economic growth. The biggest obstacles of all are new regulations that impose more than \$1 billion per year in costs on the American economy.

Struggling workers, families, and small business owners have every right to ask why regulations that cost this much are ever promulgated at all. Surely, there are less costly measures that are effective and should be adopted instead.

Those less costly measures would allow many more resources to be devoted to job creation and productive investment. But billion-dollar rules are promulgated, and there are more and more as the Obama administration grinds to an end. This is one of the reasons our economy has faced so much difficulty in achieving a full recovery under the Obama administration's misguided policies.

Making matters worse, when billion-dollar rules are challenged in court, regulated entities must often sink billions of dollars into compliance while litigation is pending even if that litigation ultimately will be successful. Such was the case in Michigan v. EPA, for example, in which an Environmental Protection Agency rule for utilities imposed about \$10 billion in costs to achieve just \$4 million to \$6 million in benefits. That is, at best, about \$1,600 in costs for every \$1 of benefit.

□ 1630

This is money for job creation and economic recovery we simply cannot

afford to waste. But EPA and the courts allowed it to be wasted for years during successful litigation challenging the rule, because neither the EPA nor the courts stayed the rule.

The REVIEW Act, introduced by Subcommittee on Regulatory Reform, Commercial and Antitrust Law Chairman MARINO, is a commonsense measure that responds to this problem with a simple, bright-line test. Under the bill, if a new regulation imposes \$1 billion or more in annual cost, it will not go into effect until after litigation challenging it is resolved. Of course, if the regulation is not challenged, it may go into effect as normal. This is a balanced approach, and it provides a healthy incentive for agencies to promulgate effective, but lower-cost regulations that are more legally sound to begin with.

I want to thank Subcommittee on Regulatory Reform, Commercial and Antitrust Law Chairman TOM MARINO for his work on this important legislation.

I urge all of my colleagues to support the bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

H.R. 3438 would stay the enforcement of any rule imposing an annual cost to the economy in excess of \$1 billion, pending judicial review.

Now, do you suspect what that might do? It would have a pernicious impact on rulemaking and the ability of agencies to respond to critical health and safety issues. In essence, the bill would encourage anyone who wants to delay a significant rule from going into effect to simply seek a judicial review of the rule.

Please, we all know that the judicial review process can take months—sometimes years—to finalize, especially if the appellate process reaches the United States Supreme Court. So rather than ensuring predictability and streamlining the rulemaking process, this bill would have the completely opposite impact by making the process less predictable and more time-consuming.

Equally important, H.R. 3438 has absolutely no health or safety emergency exceptions. If anything, this bill would empower the very entities that caused a serious health or safety risk to delay and maybe even derail legitimate efforts by regulatory agencies to respond to such threats.

As with other bills proposed by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, this legislation myopically focuses only on the cost of a proposed rule while ignoring the rule's benefits, which often exceed its costs by many multiples.

In closing, there is broad agreement among experts in the administrative law field that our Nation's regulatory system is already too cumbersome and slow-moving.

Now, in addition to the Administrative Procedure Act's procedural mechanisms which are designed to ensure an

open and fair rulemaking system, Congress has passed various additional Federal laws that impose further rulemaking requirements, and rulemaking agencies must also comply with a number of executive orders issued over the past several decades that have created additional layers of analytical and procedural requirements. The result of this dense web of existing requirements is a complex, time-consuming rulemaking process.

In response to the explosion of analytical requirements imposed on the rulemaking process, the American Bar Association as well as many administrative law experts have urged Congress to exercise restraint and assess the usefulness of existing requirements before considering sweeping legislation.

Imposing new analytical and procedural requirements on the administrative system also carries real human and economic costs. As Professor Weissman, the president of Public Citizen, has observed, the cost of regulatory delay is “far more severe than generic inefficiency. Lengthy delay costs money and lives; it permits ongoing ecologic destruction and the infliction of needless injury; and it enables fraudsters and wrongdoers to perpetuate their misdeeds.”

Rather than alleviating these problems, H.R. 3438 would clearly exacerbate them. Accordingly, I must urge Members to oppose this ill-conceived legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MARINO), the chief sponsor of the legislation and the chairman of the Regulatory Reform, Commercial and Antitrust Law Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the full committee chairman, Mr. GOODLATTE, for supporting the REVIEW Act as an original cosponsor and for moving it through the Judiciary Committee. I am also grateful for the many other Members who have cosponsored this bill.

The REVIEW Act rests upon a very simple premise: that regulations with annual costs exceeding \$1 billion annually should receive full judicial review before they go into effect.

The regulations we are concerned about are so massive that their compliance costs are felt nationwide. These regulations touch every corner of our economy. They drive up the cost to put food on the table and clothes on our backs, and, in the worst of situations, they take away the very jobs Americans have earned.

Due to these immense costs, it is not only prudent, but appropriate that aggrieved parties have their day in court. These costs demand that executive agencies must justify their reasoning and legal underpinnings of their rulemaking. Requiring American taxpayers and businesses to comply before the ju-

dicial process runs its course reeks of injustice.

Historically, these high-impact rules with costs over \$1 billion annually have been few and far between. Since 2006, there have been just 26 in total. However, in recent years, their number has grown exponentially alongside the growth and reach of the regulatory state. There have been an average of three over the past 8 years and six in 2014 alone.

Although some may insist that the straightforward reforms in this bill overreach, recent events indicate otherwise. Last summer, in the Supreme Court’s decision in *Michigan v. EPA*, we saw firsthand the irreparable harm that can occur when expansive, costly, and poorly crafted regulations are not given time for review. In this case, the Court found that the EPA had promulgated its Utility MACT power plant rule through a faulty process and on legally infirm grounds because it chose not to consider costs when promulgating the rule. The costs of the rule were estimated by the EPA itself—by the EPA who created the rule—at \$9.6 billion per year. In return, the EPA’s best estimate of potential benefits were in the range of a mere \$4 million to \$6 million—with an M—annually.

As the late Justice Antonin Scalia wrote in his opinion for the Court: “One would not say that it is even rational, never mind ‘appropriate,’ to impose billions of dollars in economic costs in return for a few dollars in health or environmental benefits.”

Unfortunately for workers, homeowners, and taxpayers across the country, when the Utility MACT rule was promulgated in early 2012 and after litigation began, neither the EPA nor Court stayed it, pending judicial review. It remained in effect as litigation took 3 years to work itself to a final decision in the Supreme Court in 2015. When review finally got to the Court, the effects were nearly irreversible.

Action on the REVIEW Act is a reasonable step on our part to continue proper and reasonable regulatory reforms.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield an additional 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Chairman, action on the REVIEW Act is a reasonable step on our part to continue proper and responsible regulatory reform.

In the end, this is a bill that encourages smaller, sensible rulemaking. When the costs are borne on the back of our constituents, this is a cause that we all certainly can get behind.

Mr. Chairman, it is not only important because of the jobs that are lost, because of the businesses, the manufacturing companies that are going out of business because of these rules by the EPA and other agencies, but it is Congress’ responsibility to litigate and Congress’ responsibility to set budgets and control the purse strings.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak in opposition to H.R. 3438, the Require Evaluation Before Implementing Executive Wishlists Act of 2016, also known as the REVIEW Act, which would automatically stay so-called high-impact rules that a party challenges by filing suit in court.

Now, this is a very arcane and esoteric subject that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will literally put you to sleep listening to their arguments about it. But make no mistake about it, this is a very important piece of legislation that would torpedo the good work of legislators who are trying to protect the health, safety, and well-being of the American people.

Simply put, this bill is yet another reckless measure designed to delay the implementation of the most important rules protecting the health, safety, and financial well-being of everyday people. Passage of this bill will only benefit the pocketbooks of the large corporations in the top 1 percent while the American people will be left unprotected from corporate greed.

Other than satisfying the insatiable thirst of the superwealthy for more and more and more profits to stuff into their already fat and overflowing pockets, this bill is completely unnecessary and is not in the best interest of the greater good.

Under current law, both courts and the agency issuing a rule may stay the effective date of a final rule. While agencies have broad discretion in postponing the effective date of a rule, a court considers several factors in deciding whether to stay a rule, including whether the party is likely to succeed on the merits.

In 2009, the Supreme Court, in *Nken v. Holder*, instructed courts to consider four factors when deciding whether to issue a stay: One, whether the stay applicant has made a strong showing that he is likely to succeed on the merits; two, whether the applicant will be irreparably injured absent a stay; three, whether the issuance of the stay will substantially injure the other parties interested in the proceedings; and, four, where the public interest lies.

The REVIEW Act would discard this very flexible and practical test in favor of an inflexible and unyielding requirement that agencies automatically delay the effective date of any rule exceeding \$1 billion in costs that is challenged in court regardless of whether the party challenging the rule has any likelihood of success on the merits, is actually harmed by the rule, or whether staying the rule would be contrary to the public interest.

□ 1645

It is virtually guaranteed that every high-impact rule would be delayed through litigation challenges, regardless of whether the litigation is meritorious. Frivolous litigation would almost certainly create years of delays

for these rules which, in many cases, have already taken years to promulgate.

But the bill wouldn't just simply apply to lifesaving rules that exceed \$1 billion in costs that keep our air clean and our children safe. Rather, it would likely apply to transfer rules which involve the transfer of funds for budgetary programs authorized by Congress, such as transfer rules involving the Medicare program or the Federal Pell Grant Program, as the Office of Management and Budget has clarified.

Lastly, Mr. Chairman, I oppose this bill because it is a dangerous solution to a nonexistent problem. Any party affected by a final agency action may challenge that action in court while agencies may also delay the effective date of rules on a discretionary basis. Professor William Funk, a leading administrative law expert, explains that existing law "weeds out frivolous claims and takes account of both the cost of the rule and the benefits of the rule that would be avoided by granting the stay." Absent any evidence whatsoever that courts have inappropriately refused to grant stays, I am confident that existing law provides adequate protection.

In closing, I urge my colleagues to oppose this legislation and make in order any of the amendments that you will hear hereafter.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER).

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the REVIEW Act. Since 2009, this administration has imposed almost 21,000 rules and regulations on U.S. families and job creators. Of those, over 200 are major regulations, costing \$108 billion annually, \$22 billion of that coming from 43 major rules just last year.

These regulations suffocate opportunity and economic freedom. Whether it is EPA's rule that will double the electricity bills of hardworking families or EPA's waters of the U.S. Federal land grab rule that will force landowners to get permission from the Federal Government in order to make decisions on their land or face onerous fines, it is time to rein in the Federal control over our lives that is hurting people.

In my district in western central Missouri, one of these rules, the Department of Labor's overtime rule, which is set to go into effect December 1, will hurt everyday Americans, raising the cost of living while reducing wages and incomes.

A senior care group in my district has told me that this rule will likely lead to a reduction in hiring, meaning fewer seniors will be able to get care. Schools have expressed concerns that they will be forced to cut staff and limit the educational services and extracurricular activities they provide for our students. A bank in my district will have to transition 13 of their salaried tellers on staff to hourly wage

workers in order to assume the \$129,000 in anticipated compliance costs from this rule. Religious organizations have also told me that they will have to cut staff, reducing their ability to provide charitable services to those in need.

Washington's top-down mandates are hurting our friends and our neighbors. We need this bill to stop these overbearing regulations which cripple industries and harm American livelihoods. Instead of stifling opportunity, we should remove barriers to job creation and economic prosperity. I urge my colleagues to support this important piece of legislation.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member for yielding.

The majority argues that H.R. 3438 responds to cases where a court vacates a rule after it has already gone into effect. The majority argues that H.R. 3438 responds to the Supreme Court's 2015 decision in *Michigan v. EPA*, where the Court remanded a clean air rule adopted by the Environmental Protection Agency to reduce power plants' emissions of hazardous air pollutants.

As leading administrator and law professor William Funk has noted, the Court remanded the rule rather than vacating it altogether because the "grounds upon which the Supreme Court found the rule invalid appear to be easily remedied." He further observes that delaying this rule would cost the U.S. economy \$20- to \$80 billion per year.

Importantly, the industry and State challengers to the EPA's rule at issue in *Michigan v. EPA* did not seek judicial stay of the rule prior to the Court's remand. Perhaps that is because they knew it would fail and that they could not meet the judicial test requiring showings of irreparable harm and likelihood of success on the merits.

These challengers are hardly in a good position to complain now about the rule being found unlawful in one respect but not unlawful with respect to every other issue raised by the challengers when they themselves even failed to ask the Court to stay the rule beforehand.

Furthermore, notwithstanding the majority's misleading claims that this rule caused irreparable harm and cost billions of dollars to implement while only offering potential benefits in the millions of dollars, the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, which is the same entity that would be charged with conducting cost estimates under the bill, states that annual benefits of the rule range between \$30- and \$90 billion, very much dwarfing its annual cost of \$9.6 billion.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I thank the ranking member.

Following the Court's remand, the EPA has reaffirmed its original finding that it is appropriate to achieve deep cuts in mercury and up to 7 dozen hazardous air pollutants such as lead, arsenic, and benzene from coal-burning power plants even after considering cost, which was the only issue in the Supreme Court's remand of the case.

This rule delivers immense benefits to Americans, with monetized benefits greatly outweighing compliance costs. An automatic stay brought by the REVIEW Act would result in all of those health hazards—4,200 premature deaths, 2,800 cases of chronic bronchitis, and on and on and on. The automatic stay brought by the REVIEW Act, if it passes, would result in so many health hazards occurring to Americans and health costs being borne by the public after the rules compliance date.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this ill-founded and ill-conceived piece of legislation.

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

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, there is broad opposition to H.R. 3438. In the context of a veto threat, the Obama administration notes in its Statement of Administration Policy that H.R. 3438 would "promote unwarranted litigation, introduce harmful delay, and, in many cases, thwart implementation of statutory mandates and execution of duly enacted laws," and would also "increase business uncertainty and undermine much-needed protections for the American public, including critical rules that provide financial reform and protect public health, food safety, and the environment."

The Coalition for Sensible Safeguards, which includes more than 150 diverse labor, consumer, public health, food safety, financial reform, faith, environmental, and scientific integrity groups representing millions of Americans, strongly opposes H.R. 3438, stating that it "will make the single biggest problem in our current regulatory process, namely, excessive and out of control regulatory delays, even worse."

Other leading consumer and public interest groups strongly oppose this misguided legislation, noting that, "like numerous other anti-regulatory bills," H.R. 3438 "further tilts the regulatory process in favor of corporate special interests by creating more opportunities for the manipulation and abuse of the process to their benefit and at the expense of protecting consumers, working families, and other vulnerable communities."

Indeed, this bill is no different than the many other antiregulatory bills considered this Congress. It is a dangerous solution to a problem that is nonexistent. Accordingly, I urge each and every one of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to resist this and oppose H.R. 3438.

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

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

The gentleman from Michigan makes reference to the administration's Statement of Administration Policy on H.R. 3438. The administration opposes this bill precisely because it would be effective. It would help to halt their regulatory overreach. The administration claims that this bill is unnecessary because rulemaking procedures already exist to ensure that new rules are as least burdensome as possible and produce a net benefit, and courts already can issue judicial stays. But the whole reason for this legislation is that the administration is ignoring such procedures. The courts rarely issue judicial stays, and by the time the courts finally strike down illegal rules, it is too late.

For example, the administration lost in *Michigan v. EPA* because it failed to consider the costs and benefits of the rule which imposed about \$10 billion in costs to achieve just \$4- to \$6 million in benefits. By the time the Court issued the ruling, huge sums had already been spent on compliance.

These are resources that otherwise could have gone into productive jobs and investment rather than complying with an illegal rule. Our economy cannot afford this waste. Do not be fooled by the administration's fear-mongering about delaying rules addressing public safety emergencies. It is difficult to imagine a public safety emergency requiring a billion-dollar rule to solve.

Indeed, we reviewed a list of billion-dollar rules issued since 2000, and not one responds to an immediate public safety emergency. Even if there were such a case, imposing costs of that magnitude for whatever reason should be made by elected representatives accountable to the people, not agency bureaucrats. Instead of recommending a veto of this bill, the President's senior advisers should recommend agencies faithfully follow rulemaking procedures so Congress does not have to shorten the leash even further.

Billion-dollar rules are a fast-growing plague inflicted by Washington's out-of-control regulators on small businesses and ordinary citizens throughout the land. According to a 2014 report by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, over 30 billion-dollar rules since the year 2000 are imposing roughly \$100 billion a year in costs on our struggling economy. The American Action Forum reports that the Obama administration plans to impose at least another \$113 billion in regulatory costs before it leaves office, and this is on top of the estimated \$2 trillion-plus in total costs from Washington regulators that are crushing our economy and strangling economic recovery.

□ 1700

It is time for measures that shout, "Stop," to Washington's regulators

and force them to find a better way. That is exactly what this bill does. It imposes automatic stays when new billion-dollar rules are challenged in court so small businesses and hard-working Americans don't have to bear the crushing cost of illegal rules while they pursue their rights in court. It creates a powerful incentive for agencies tempted to zoom past the billion-dollar mark to stop, turn around, and find a less costly way to achieve the same benefits for the American people.

Hopefully, once this bill becomes law, we will stop seeing needless billion-dollar rules. And if we ever do need a billion-dollar-a-year solution, this bill will help make sure regulators leave it to the accountable Members of Congress to make such monumental policy decisions by statute.

I urge all of my colleagues to support the bill.

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

The 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 the Judiciary, 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. 3438

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 "Require Evaluation before Implementing Executive Wishlists Act of 2016" or as the "REVIEW Act of 2016".

SEC. 2. RELIEF PENDING REVIEW.

Section 705 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking "When" and inserting the following:

"(a) IN GENERAL.—When"; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

"(b) HIGH-IMPACT RULES.—

(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection—

"(A) the term 'Administrator' means the Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs of the Office of Management and Budget; and

"(B) the term 'high-impact rule' means any rule that the Administrator determines may impose an annual cost on the economy of not less than \$1,000,000.

"(2) IDENTIFICATION.—A final rule may not be published or take effect until the agency making the rule submits the rule to the Administrator and the Administrator makes a determination as to whether the rule is a high-impact rule, which shall be published by the agency with the final rule.

"(3) RELIEF.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), an agency shall postpone the effective date of a high-impact rule of the agency until the final disposition of all actions seeking judicial review of the rule.

"(B) FAILURE TO TIMELY SEEK JUDICIAL REVIEW.—Notwithstanding section 553(d), if no

person seeks judicial review of a high-impact rule—

"(i) during any period explicitly provided for judicial review under the statute authorizing the making of the rule; or

"(ii) if no such period is explicitly provided for, during the 60-day period beginning on the date on which the high-impact rule is published in the Federal Register,

the high-impact rule may take effect as early as the date on which the applicable period ends.

"(4) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection may be construed to impose any limitation under law on any court against the issuance of any order enjoining the implementation of any rule."

The CHAIR. No amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in House Report 114-777. 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. CICILLINE

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 114-777.

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 3, line 19, strike ";" and" and insert a semicolon.

Page 3, line 21, insert after "rule" the following: "(other than an excepted rule)".

Page 3, line 23, strike the period and insert ";" and".

Page 3, insert after line 23 the following:

(C) the term "excepted rule" means any rule that would reduce the cost of healthcare for a person over the age of 65.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 875, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Chair, my amendment would exempt rules that reduce the cost of health care for Americans over the age of 65 from the unnecessary requirements of this legislation.

Mr. Chair, our country's seniors face growing healthcare costs, and any delays in rules that could reduce those costs would be a terrible burden to place on America's seniors.

According to the latest retiree healthcare cost estimates from Fidelity Benefits Consulting, a 65-year-old couple retiring this year will need an average of \$260,000 in today's dollars to cover medical expenses throughout their retirement. That applies only to retirees with traditional Medicare insurance coverage and does not include costs associated with nursing home care.

Fidelity estimates that a 65-year-old couple would need an additional

\$130,000 to ensure against long-term care expenses. That is because the median annual cost for the base rent at an assisted living community is about \$41,000 per year. The average annual cost for skilled nursing is about \$71,000 per year. Because much long-term care is provided by unpaid family caregivers or is covered by Medicaid, the average senior's lifetime out-of-pocket long-term care expenses are about \$50,000.

The legislation before us would open up the rulemaking process to lengthy delay tactics, allowing companies or entities opposed to certain rules to take advantage of the court system to stymie final rulemaking for years. Our seniors don't have years to wait on policies that could save them precious dollars in their retirement. There is already a robust process in place for opponents to challenge them in court, with the decision whether to delay a rule rightly placed in the court's hands.

This legislation is a gift to special interests who will benefit from the delay of the imposition of rules that reduce costs for seniors. These special interests are willing to spend millions of dollars and waste years fighting regulations that will benefit the American people, particularly our seniors.

High-impact rules typically involve either the transfer of Federal funds or rules with billions of dollars in benefits to the public. During fiscal year 2014, for example, executive branch agencies adopted 53 major rules, 35 of which were transfer rules. According to the Office of Management and Budget, transfer rules merely implement Federal budgetary programs as required or authorized by Congress, such as rules associated with the Medicare program and the Federal Pell Grant Program.

There are 44.9 million seniors on Medicare in this country. Frivolous lawsuits to delay rules that will increase benefits or those that will produce cost savings would be a grave betrayal of the promise that we have made to keep America's seniors healthy.

My amendment simply ensures that any rule that reduces costs of health care for Americans 65 or older will not be subject to unnecessary delays.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, the REVIEW Act applies to all new billion-dollar rules. That is for one simple reason: the harm that wasting billions of dollars in unnecessary compliance costs does to job creation, productive investment, and economic recovery. Those costs should not have to be incurred during ultimately successful litigation challenging new billion-dollar rules.

The amendment is concerned primarily with transfer rules that authorize the flow of funding between Federal healthcare accounts for seniors. With respect to those rules, there is no need for concern that the bill would impede the operation of those rules. To my knowledge, there has never been a billion-dollar transfer rule, much less one affecting seniors, that has been challenged in court, nor am I aware of any reason to expect that one ever will be challenged. The bill, of course, only requires a stay if a timely challenge to a rule is brought in court.

As for other rules that may be within the amendment's scope, if such rules are needed, then agencies can avoid the bill's application by coming up with effective regulations that cost less than \$1 billion a year. That is a goal to be pursued, not blocked.

If, in an unusual case, the needed solution truly must cost a billion dollars a year or more, then the decision to adopt that solution is a decision Congress should make, not an agency. Congress, moreover, can make that decision without hindrance of litigation through fair and open consideration and debate by the people's Representatives, not unaccountable bureaucrats.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment.

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Chair, the chairman just made my point. This legislation, as currently written, would apply to all rules, including rules that would reduce the cost of health care for America's seniors. In fact, the OMB says—and I repeat—that a transfer rule merely “implements Federal budgetary programs, as required or authorized by Congress, such as rules associated with the Medicare program and the Federal Pell Grant Program.”

So we know, in fact, that, according to OMB, the Medicare program is considered part of the transfer rule. So this legislation, as currently written, means that all rules, including any rule that is promulgated that would reduce costs for seniors would, in fact, be subjected to this delay.

My amendment is necessary, by the chairman's own admission. We need this amendment so that we can at least exempt out those provisions that might produce real savings for America's seniors.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time. The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MS. DELBENE

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 114-777.

Ms. DELBENE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 3, line 19, strike “; and” and insert a semicolon.

Page 3, line 21, insert after “rule” the following: “(other than an excepted rule)”.

Page 3, line 23, strike the period and insert “; and”.

Page 3, insert after line 23 the following:

(C) the term “excepted rule” means any rule that would increase college affordability.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 875, the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DELBENE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Washington.

Ms. DELBENE. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of my amendment to H.R. 3438, which would exempt from the bill any rule related to increasing the affordability of higher education.

It is no secret that the rising cost of college is posing grave challenges to students and families across the country. Every year, Americans are being forced to take out higher loan amounts to pay for tuition, fees, textbooks, and housing. Today, student debt totals more than \$1.3 trillion.

In my home State of Washington, 56 percent of graduates from 4-year universities leave school with debt and, on average, those students owe more than \$23,000 upon graduation. At a time when Americans owe more in student loan debt than credit card debt, it is more critical than ever that we prioritize college affordability for all.

The issue is personal for me. When I was young, my father lost his job, and my parents never got back on track financially. But thanks to student loans and financial aid, I was still able to get a great education. With that education and hard work, I was able to build a successful career and be in the position that I am in today.

We need to make sure students have the same opportunities that were available to us. That starts by protecting the Department of Education's ability to administer vital financial aid programs like Pell grants and Federal student loans. These programs have enabled millions of low-income students to attend college. If we restrict the Department's ability to administer them, we are also endangering the millions of hardworking Americans who rely on their critical support.

This year alone, more than 8.4 million low-income students will benefit from Pell grants. Over 20 million student loans will be issued to help students and families afford the cost of college. We cannot put these essential resources at risk. They help ensure higher education is never out of reach, and they must be protected.

That is why I am offering this straightforward and narrowly tailored amendment. It simply protects the Department of Education's ability to administer Federal student aid programs that keep college affordable and accessible to all.

Today, too many families are struggling to put their kids through college, and we should be making it easier for them, not harder. My amendment will prevent the underlying bill from threatening the vital assistance offered each year through Pell grants, student loans, and other forms of financial aid.

Particularly as students are heading back to school in communities across the country, I urge my colleagues to support this important amendment.

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

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MARINO. Once again, the REVIEW Act applies to all new billion-dollar rules. The bill's relief is urgently needed. Failures to require stays of billion-dollar rules during litigation wastes billions of dollars in unnecessary compliance costs and resources that are needlessly paid. Those costs are essential to job creation, productive investment, and economic recovery. These costs should not have to be incurred during ultimate successful litigation challenging new billion-dollar rules.

If education rules like those the amendment would carve out are needed, the relevant agencies can avoid the bill's application by coming up with effective regulations that cost less than \$1 billion a year. That is a goal to be pursued, not blocked, especially when it is the presence in higher education that is actually driving up much of the cost concerning the upward spiral in the cost of higher education.

If, in an unusual case, a needed solution truly must cost a billion dollars a year or more, then, once again, the decision to adopt that solution is a decision Congress should make, not an agency.

With all due respect, my friend and I have worked on legislation together. I have a list here of the billion-dollar rules and there is nothing—not one name on here—that has anything to do with the Department of Education.

Furthermore, I would love to work on a piece of legislation reducing the cost of post-high school education with my colleague. I didn't start college until after I was 30. My wife and I put me through college and law school. We borrowed money through grants and anything we could do. I know the cost of education was expensive back then, and I am stymied at what it is now, but this is not the mechanism to do that.

This legislation that Republicans brought to the floor—my legislation—deals with overseeing the government

and the regulation that is crushing jobs in this country. Congress has the responsibility, as I repeat, to make the laws and to control the purse strings.

So I offer again to my good friend an opportunity to work with her on lowering the cost of education in this country, but I think it should be in a separate piece of legislation and not this. I ask my colleagues to not support the amendment and I ask them to support the overall legislation that we brought to the floor.

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

Ms. DELBENE. Mr. Chairman, the bill, as it exists, doesn't require challenges to have any merit, so it opens the door to frivolous lawsuits. The Office of Management and Budget did say that this would hit the billion-dollar threshold.

I do think that it is very, very important that we support my amendment so that we protect students today from harmful, unintended consequences of the REVIEW Act. I want to thank my colleague for being willing to work together on ways to improve college affordability going forward. I would ask that he support this amendment as part of that, but I would be happy to work with him on other issues as well.

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

□ 1715

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington (Ms. DELBENE).

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

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

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 114-777 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 by Mr. CICILLINE of Rhode Island.

Amendment No. 2 by Ms. DELBENE of Washington.

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. CICILLINE

The CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE) 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 CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 189, noes 232, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 532]

AYES—189

Adams	Frankel (FL)	Nadler
Aguilar	Fudge	Napolitano
Ashford	Gabbard	Neal
Bass	Gallego	Nolan
Beatty	Garamendi	Norcross
Becerra	Graham	O'Rourke
Bera	Grayson	Pallone
Beyer	Green, Al	Pascrell
Bishop (GA)	Green, Gene	Payne
Blum	Grijalva	Pelosi
Blumenauer	Gutiérrez	Perlmutter
Bonamici	Hahn	Peters
Boyle, Brendan	Hastings	Pingree
F.	Heck (WA)	Pocan
Brady (PA)	Higgins	Poliquin
Brown (FL)	Himes	Polis
Brownley (CA)	Hinojosa	Price (NC)
Bustos	Honda	Quigley
Butterfield	Hoyer	Rangel
Capps	Huffman	Rice (NY)
Capuano	Israel	Richmond
Cárdenas	Jackson Lee	Rigell
Carney	Jeffries	Ros-Lehtinen
Carson (IN)	Johnson (GA)	Royal-Allard
Cartwright	Johnson, E. B.	Ruiz
Castor (FL)	Jones	Ruppersberger
Castro (TX)	Kaptur	Ryan (OH)
Chu, Judy	Katko	Sánchez, Linda
Cicilline	Keating	T.
Clark (MA)	Kelly (IL)	Sarbanes
Clarke (NY)	Kennedy	Schakowsky
Clay	Kildee	Schiff
Cleaver	Kilmer	Scott (VA)
Clyburn	Kind	Scott, David
Cohen	Kirkpatrick	Serrano
Connolly	Kuster	Sewell (AL)
Conyers	Langevin	Sherman
Cooper	Larsen (WA)	Sinema
Costa	Larson (CT)	Sires
Courtney	Lawrence	Slaughter
Crowley	Lee	Smith (WA)
Cuellar	Levin	Speier
Cummings	Lewis	Swalwell (CA)
Curbelo (FL)	Lieu, Ted	Takano
Davis (CA)	Lipinski	Thompson (CA)
Davis, Danny	Loeb sack	Thompson (MS)
DeFazio	Lofgren	Titus
DeGette	Lowenthal	Tonko
Delaney	Lowey	Torres
DeLauro	Lujan Grisham	Tsongas
DelBene	(NM)	Van Hollen
Dent	Luján, Ben Ray	Vargas
DeSaulnier	(NM)	Veasey
Deutch	Lynch	Vela
Dingell	Maloney,	Velázquez
Doggett	Carolyn	Visclosky
Doyle, Michael	Maloney, Sean	Walz
F.	Matsui	Wasserman
Duckworth	McCollum	Schultz
Edwards	McDermott	Waters, Maxine
Ellison	McGovern	Watson Coleman
Engel	McNerney	Welch
Eshoo	Meeks	Wilson (FL)
Esty	Meng	Yarmuth
Farr	Moulton	
Foster	Murphy (FL)	
		NOES—232
Abraham	Bucshon	Denham
Aderholt	Burgess	DeSantis
Allen	Byrne	DesJarlais
Amash	Calvert	Diaz-Balart
Amodei	Carter (GA)	Dold
Babin	Carter (TX)	Donovan
Barletta	Chabot	Duffy
Barr	Chaffetz	Duncan (SC)
Barton	Clawson (FL)	Duncan (TN)
Benishek	Coffman	Ellmers (NC)
Bilirakis	Cole	Emmer (MN)
Bishop (MI)	Collins (GA)	Farenthold
Bishop (UT)	Collins (NY)	Fincher
Black	Comstock	Fitzpatrick
Blackburn	Conaway	Fleischmann
Bost	Cook	Fleming
Boustany	Costello (PA)	Flores
Brady (TX)	Cramer	Forbes
Brat	Crawford	Fortenberry
Bridenstine	Crenshaw	Foxx
Brooks (IN)	Culberson	Franks (AZ)
Buchanan	Davidson	Frelinghuysen
Buck	Davis, Rodney	Garrett

Gibbs Loudermilk
 Gibson Love
 Gohmert Lucas
 Goodlatte Luetkemeyer
 Gosar Lummis
 Gowdy MacArthur
 Granger Marchant
 Graves (GA) Marino
 Graves (LA) Massie
 Graves (MO) McCarthy
 Griffith McCaul
 Grothman McClintock
 Guinta McHenry
 Guthrie McKinley
 Hanna McMorris
 Hardy Rodgers
 Harper McSally
 Harris Meadows
 Hartzler Meehan
 Heck (NV) Messer
 Hensarling Mica
 Herrera Beutler Miller (FL)
 Hice, Jody B. Miller (MI)
 Hill Moolenaar
 Holding Mooney (WV)
 Hudson Mullin
 Huelskamp Mulvaney
 Huizenga (MI) Murphy (PA)
 Hultgren Neugebauer
 Hunter Newhouse
 Hurd (TX) Noem
 Hurt (VA) Nugent
 Issa Nunes
 Jenkins (KS) Olson
 Jenkins (WV) Palazzo
 Johnson (OH) Paulsen
 Johnson, Sam Pearce
 Jolly Perry
 Jordan Peterson
 Joyce Pittenger
 Kelly (MS) Pitts
 Kelly (PA) Pompeo
 King (IA) Posey
 King (NY) Price, Tom
 Kinzinger (IL) Ratcliffe
 Kline Reed
 Knight Reichert
 Labrador Renacci
 LaHood Ribble
 LaMalfa Rice (SC)
 Lamborn Roby
 Lance Roe (TN)
 Latta Rogers (KY)
 LoBiondo Rohrabacher
 Long Rokita

NOT VOTING—10

Brooks (AL) Rogers (AL)
 Moore Rush
 Palmer Sanchez, Loretta
 Poe (TX) Schrader

□ 1742

Messrs. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, WESTBER of Florida, WESTERMAN, REICHERT, HURT of Virginia, BURGESS, BILIRAKIS, COLLINS of New York, Ms. STEFANIK, Messrs. WOODALL, GOODLATTE, JOLLY, Ms. GRANGER, and Mr. MOOLENAAR changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Messrs. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, DENT, BLUM, CURBELO of Florida, and KATKO changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MS. DELBENE

The CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DELBENE) 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 CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.
 A recorded vote was ordered.
 The CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.
 The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 184, noes 237, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 533]
 AYES—184

Adams Fudge
 Aguilar Gabbard
 Ashford Gallego
 Beatty Garamendi
 Becerra Graham
 Bera Grayson
 Beyer Green, Al
 Bishop (GA) Green, Gene
 Blumenauer Grijalva
 Bonamici Gutierrez
 Boyle, Brendan Hahn
 F. Hanna
 Brady (PA) Hastings
 Brown (FL) Heck (WA)
 Brownley (CA) Higgins
 Bustos Himes
 Butterfield Hinojosa
 Capps Honda
 Capuano Hoyer
 Cárdenas Huffman
 Carney Israel
 Carson (IN) Jackson Lee
 Cartwright Jeffries
 Castor (FL) Johnson (GA)
 Castro (TX) Johnson, E. B.
 Chu, Judy Jones
 Cicilline Kaptur
 Clark (MA) Keating
 Clarke (NY) Kelly (IL)
 Clay Kennedy
 Cleaver Kilmer
 Clyburn Kind
 Cohen Kirkpatrick
 Connolly Kuster
 Conyers Langevin
 Cooper Larsen (WA)
 Costa Larson (CT)
 Costello (PA) Lawrence
 Courtney Lee
 Crowley Levin
 Cuellar Lewis
 Cummings Curbelo (FL)
 Curbelo (FL) Lieu, Ted
 Davis (CA) Lipinski
 Davis, Danny Loebbeck
 DeFazio Lofgren
 DeGette Lowenthal
 Delaney Lowey
 DeLauro Lujan Grisham (NM)
 DelBene Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
 DeSaulnier Lujan, Ben Ray (NM)
 Deutch Lynch
 Dingell Maloney,
 Doggett Doyle, Michael
 Doyle, Michael F.
 Duckworth Matsui
 Edwards McCollum
 Ellison McDermott
 Engel McGovern
 Eshoo McNeerney
 Esty Meeks
 Foster Meng
 Frankel (FL) Moulton

NOES—237

Abraham Collins (GA)
 Aderholt Collins (NY)
 Allen Comstock
 Amash Conaway
 Amodei Cook
 Babin Cramer
 Barletta Crawford
 Barr Bucshon
 Barton Burgess
 Benishek Byrne
 Bilirakis Calvert
 Bishop (MI) Carter (GA)
 Bishop (UT) Carter (TX)
 Black Chabot
 Blackburn Chaffetz
 Blum Clawson (FL)
 Bost Coffman
 Boustany Cole

Duffy Kinzinger (IL)
 Duncan (SC) Kline
 Duncan (TN) Knight
 Ellmers (NC) Labrador
 Emmer (MN) LaHood
 Farenthold LaMalfa
 Farr Lamborn
 Fincher Lance
 Fitzpatrick Latta
 Fleischmann LoBiondo
 Fleming Long
 Flores Loudermilk
 Forbes Love
 Fortenberry Lucas
 Foss Luetkemeyer
 Fox Franks (AZ)
 Franks (AZ) MacArthur
 Frelinghuysen Garrett
 Garrett Marchant
 Gibbs Marino
 Gibson Massie
 Gohmert McCarthy
 Goodlatte McCaul
 Gosar McClintock
 Gowdy McHenry
 Granger McKinley
 Graves (GA) McMorris
 Graves (LA) Rodgers
 Graves (MO) McSally
 Griffith Meadows
 Grothman Meehan
 Guinta Messer
 Guthrie Mica
 Hardy Miller (FL)
 Harper Miller (MI)
 Harris Moolenaar
 Hartzler Mooney (WV)
 Heck (NV) Mullin
 Hensarling Mulvaney
 Herrera Beutler Murphy (PA)
 Hice, Jody B. Neugebauer
 Hill Newhouse
 Holding Noem
 Hudson Nugent
 Huelskamp Nunes
 Huizenga (MI) Olson
 Hultgren Palazzo
 Hunter Palmer
 Hurd (TX) Paulsen
 Hurt (VA) Pearce
 Issa Perry
 Jenkins (KS) Peterson
 Jenkins (WV) Pittenger
 Johnson (OH) Pitts
 Johnson, Sam Pompeo
 Jolly Posey
 Jordan Price, Tom
 Joyce Ratcliffe
 Katko Reed
 Kelly (MS) Reichert
 Kelly (PA) Renacci
 King (IA) Ribble
 King (NY) Rice (SC)
 Kinzinger (IL) Yoder
 Kline Young (AK)
 Knight Young (IA)
 Labrador Young (IN)
 LaHood Zeldin
 LaMalfa Zinke
 Lamborn

NOT VOTING—10

Bass Rogers (AL)
 Moore Rush
 Poe (TX) Sanchez, Loretta
 Rice (NY) Schrader

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1746

So the amendment was rejected.
 The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIR. The question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The amendment was agreed to.
 The CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois) having assumed the chair, Mr. SIMPSON, 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. 3438) to amend title 5, United States Code, to postpone the effective date of high-impact rules pending judicial review, and, pursuant

to House Resolution 875, 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.

The question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

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.

□ 1745

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. I am opposed in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Thompson of Mississippi moves to recommit the bill H.R. 3438 to the Committee on the Judiciary with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Page 3, line 21, insert after "rule" the following: "(except as provided in subsection (c))".

Page 5, insert after "of any rule." on line 4 the following:

"(c) EXCEPTION FOR RULES TO DECREASE THE VULNERABILITY OF THE PUBLIC TO A TERRORIST ATTACK.—The provisions of subsection (b) do not apply in the case of a rule that pertains to protecting the Nation against security threats."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Mississippi is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill, which will not kill the bill or send it back to the committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage, as amended.

Just over a week ago, the Nation observed the 15th anniversary of the September 11, 2001, terrorist attack. On that day, terror and hate not only took the lives of 3,000 innocent people, but also inflicted \$3.3 trillion in economic damage to our Nation. In response to this unprecedented attack on U.S. soil, the Department of Homeland Security was established.

To be successful, DHS must work with State, local, and private sector partners. Many of DHS's programs are voluntary, but in some areas, where the threats are high and voluntary measures are inadequate, DHS utilizes Federal rulemaking.

As we saw last weekend in Minnesota, New York, and New Jersey, the threat picture is constantly evolving. Today, the threat of individuals acting alone, inspired online by foreign and domestic terrorist groups, is arguably

one of the greatest homeland security challenges we face. Our government needs to be able to respond to evolving threats like the "lone wolf" threat.

I am alarmed to see that, under this bill, critical action by the Department of Homeland Security could be indefinitely hamstrung, as protracted, possibly frivolous, legal challenges move through the courts. From a homeland security standpoint, there is no justification for putting arbitrary obstacles in the way of DHS when it needs to issue regulations to protect critical infrastructure from infiltration by terrorists, keep dangerous materials out of terrorists' hands, and secure the border, yet the underlying bill would do just that.

Mr. Speaker, my motion to recommit would provide for an exception to the rule in instances that "pertain to protecting the Nation against security threats." There are things we can do to make the country more secure, but it seems that the majority lacks the will to do so.

Earlier today, Democrats tried to get legislation to bar individuals on the no-fly terrorist watch list from buying guns considered. The majority blocked the legislation.

Then we tried to get considered a measure that I authored to expand DHS' overseas screening and vetting operations to protect ISIL-trained European foreign fighters and other dangerous people from entering the United States. This measure was blocked, too.

This morning, Mr. Speaker, in my committee, we received testimony from prominent law enforcement officials about how the availability of firearms put their officers and the citizens they protect in harm's way. In fact, Mr. Speaker, the Austin, Texas, police chief testified that police chiefs are "haunted" by the threat posed by the "widespread availability of firearms in our country," which "makes it possible for potentially dangerous persons to legally acquire weapons to cause mayhem and colossal casualties."

To this point, this past weekend, in a St. Cloud, Minnesota, mall, 10 people, including a pregnant woman, were stabbed by a young man who is believed to have been radicalized by ISIL. Thankfully, all the injured individuals are expected to recover.

These days, it is not too hard to imagine the carnage that could have been inflicted on this innocent population if the assailant had, instead, entered the mall with an AK-47 assault weapon and large-capacity clips.

This Congress must show leadership on the pressing homeland security challenges to the Nation. Standing in the way of the Department of Homeland Security, as it tries to protect our citizens, is the wrong thing to do.

For these and a number of other reasons, Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to vote "aye" on my motion to recommit.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

Mr. Speaker, billion-dollar rules are among the worst offenses of the pen-and-phone Obama administration. This administration is using overreaching billion-dollar rules to insert EPA's water permitting agents into every American's backyard. It is using overreaching billion-dollar rules to shut down this country's cheap generation of electricity. It is using overreaching billion-dollar rules to impose unachievable ozone standards that will strangle economic opportunities in counties all over this Nation. Above all, wherever it can, it is using overreaching billion-dollar rules to execute end runs around Congress and achieve legislative ends it knows it cannot achieve in Congress.

The Obama administration says, on spurious grounds, it will veto this bill.

This motion to recommit tries to obstruct this bill by means of procedural obstruction. The House has already passed antiterrorism measures. Why do my colleagues across the aisle want to block this good bill?

The legislation that we have passed is H.R. 4401, the Amplifying Local Efforts to Root Out Terror Act; H.R. 4820, the Combating Terrorist Recruitment Act; and H.R. 4407, the Counterterrorism Advisory Board Act. These were all almost unanimously passed. I sit on the Committee on Homeland Security. We have been passing good legislation, and we continue to pass good legislation.

This administration and its allies on the other side of the aisle would rather let Congress duck accountability to the voters for billion-dollar decisions. It would rather give billion-dollar phones and pens to unaccountable bureaucrats up and down Pennsylvania Avenue so they can do things the voters cannot stop.

The American people are telling us every day, "Enough." I am telling President Obama and my colleagues, "Enough."

Stand up for accountability. Stand up for the small-business owners and workers who are being crushed by Washington's bureaucratic billion-dollar bullies who are against this motion and please vote for this bill.

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 yeas appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX,

this 5-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on passage of the bill, if ordered; passage of H.R. 5461; and suspending the rules and passing the following bills: H.R. 5859, H.R. 6007, H.R. 5977, H.R. 6014, and H.R. 5147.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 182, noes 240, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 534]

AYES—182

Adams	Frankel (FL)	Murphy (FL)
Aguilar	Fudge	Nadler
Ashford	Gabbard	Napolitano
Bass	Galleo	Neal
Beatty	Garamendi	Nolan
Becerra	Graham	Norcross
Bera	Grayson	O'Rourke
Beyer	Green, Al	Pallone
Bishop (GA)	Green, Gene	Pascrell
Blumenauer	Grijalva	Payne
Bonamici	Gutiérrez	Pelosi
Boyle, Brendan	Hahn	Perlmutter
F.	Hastings	Peters
Brady (PA)	Heck (WA)	Pingree
Brown (FL)	Higgins	Pocan
Brownley (CA)	Himes	Polis
Bustos	Hinojosa	Price (NC)
Butterfield	Honda	Quigley
Capps	Hoyer	Rangel
Capuano	Huffman	Rice (NY)
Cárdenas	Israel	Richmond
Carney	Jackson Lee	Roybal-Allard
Carson (IN)	Jeffries	Ruiz
Cartwright	Johnson (GA)	Ruppersberger
Castor (FL)	Johnson, E. B.	Ryan (OH)
Castro (TX)	Kaptur	Sánchez, Linda
Chu, Judy	Keating	T.
Cicilline	Kelly (IL)	Sarbanes
Clark (MA)	Kennedy	Schakowsky
Clarke (NY)	Kildee	Schiff
Clay	Kilmer	Schrader
Cleaver	Kind	Scott (VA)
Clyburn	Kirkpatrick	Scott, David
Cohen	Kuster	Serrano
Connolly	Langevin	Sewell (AL)
Conyers	Larsen (WA)	Sherman
Cooper	Larson (CT)	Sinema
Costa	Lawrence	Sires
Courtney	Lee	Slaughter
Crowley	Levin	Smith (WA)
Cuellar	Lewis	Speier
Cummings	Lieu, Ted	Swalwell (CA)
Davis (CA)	Lipinski	Takano
Davis, Danny	Loeb sack	Thompson (CA)
DeFazio	Lofgren	Thompson (MS)
DeGette	Lowenthal	Titus
Delaney	Lowe y	Tonko
DeLauro	Lujan Grisham	Torres
DelBene	(NM)	Tsongas
DeSaulnier	Luján, Ben Ray	Van Hollen
Deutch	(NM)	Vargas
Dingell	Lynch	Veasey
Doggett	Maloney,	Vela
Doyle, Michael	Carolyn	Velázquez
F.	Maloney, Sean	Visclosky
Duckworth	Matsui	Walz
Edwards	McCullum	Wasserman
Ellison	McDermott	Schultz
Engel	McGovern	Waters, Maxine
Eshoo	McNerney	Watson Coleman
Esty	Meeks	Welch
Farr	Meng	Wilson (FL)
Foster	Moulton	Yarmuth

NOES—240

Abraham	Brady (TX)	Collins (GA)
Aderholt	Brat	Collins (NY)
Allen	Bridenstine	Comstock
Amash	Brooks (AL)	Conaway
Amodei	Brooks (IN)	Cook
Babin	Buchanan	Costello (PA)
Barletta	Buck	Cramer
Barr	Bucshon	Crawford
Barton	Burgess	Crenshaw
Benishek	Byrne	Culberson
Bilirakis	Calvert	Curbelo (FL)
Bishop (MI)	Carter (GA)	Davidson
Bishop (UT)	Carter (TX)	Davis, Rodney
Black	Chabot	Denham
Blackburn	Chaffetz	Dent
Blum	Clawson (FL)	DeSantis
Bost	Coffman	DesJarlais
Boustany	Cole	Diaz-Balart

Dold	King (NY)	Rice (SC)
Donovan	Kinzinger (IL)	Rigell
Duncan (SC)	Kline	Roby
Duncan (TN)	Knight	Roe (TN)
Ellmers (NC)	Labrador	Rogers (AL)
Emmer (MN)	LaHood	Rogers (KY)
Farenthold	LaMalfa	Rohrabacher
Fincher	Lamborn	Rokita
Fitzpatrick	Lance	Rooney (FL)
Fleischmann	Latta	Ros-Lehtinen
Fleming	LoBiondo	Roskam
Flores	Long	Ross
Forbes	Loudermilk	Rothfus
Fortenberry	Love	Rouzer
Fox x	Lucas	Royce
Franks (AZ)	Luetkemeyer	Russell
Frelinghuysen	Lummis	Salmon
Garrett	MacArthur	Sanford
Gibbs	Marchant	Scalise
Gibson	Marino	Schweikert
Gohmert	Massie	Scott, Austin
Goodlatte	McCarthy	Sensenbrenner
Gosar	McCaul	Sessions
Gowdy	McClintock	Shimkus
Granger	McHenry	Shuster
Graves (GA)	McKinley	Simpson
Graves (LA)	McMorris	Smith (MO)
Graves (MO)	Rodgers	Smith (NE)
Griffith	McSally	Smith (NJ)
Grothman	Meadows	Smith (TX)
Guinta	Meehan	Stefanik
Guthrie	Messer	Stewart
Hanna	Mica	Stutzman
Hardy	Miller (FL)	Thompson (PA)
Harper	Miller (MI)	Thornberry
Harris	Moolenaar	Tipton
Hartzler	Mooney (WV)	Trott
Heck (NV)	Mullin	Turner
Hensarling	Mulvaney	Upton
Herrera Beutler	Murphy (PA)	Valadao
Hice, Jody B.	Neugebauer	Wagner
Hill	Newhouse	Walberg
Holding	Noem	Walker
Hudson	Nugent	Walorski
Huelskamp	Nunes	Weber (TX)
Huizenga (MI)	Olson	Webster (FL)
Hultgren	Palazzo	Westerman
Hunter	Palmer	Westmoreland
Hurd (TX)	Paulsen	Williams
Hurt (VA)	Pearce	Wilson (SC)
Issa	Perry	Wittman
Jenkins (KS)	Peterson	Womack
Jenkins (WV)	Pittenger	Woodall
Johnson (OH)	Pitts	Yoho
Johnson, Sam	Poliquin	Young (AK)
Jolly	Pompeo	Young (IA)
Jones	Posey	Young (IN)
Jordan	Price, Tom	Zeldin
Joyce	Ratcliffe	Zinke
Katko	Reed	
Kelly (MS)	Reichert	
Kelly (PA)	Renacci	
King (IA)	Ribble	

NOT VOTING—9

Duffy	Rush	Tiberi
Moore	Lujan, Loretta	Walters, Mimi
Poe (TX)	Stivers	Yoder

□ 1804

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.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. CONYERS. 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 244, noes 180, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 535]

AYES—244

Abraham	Allen	Amodei
Aderholt	Amash	Ashford

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

NOES—180

Adams	Capuano	Cooper
Aguilar	Cárdenas	Costa
Bass	Carney	Courtney
Beatty	Carson (IN)	Crowley
Becerra	Cartwright	Cummings
Bera	Castor (FL)	Davis (CA)
Beyer	Castro (TX)	Davis, Danny
Blumenauer	Chu, Judy	DeFazio
Bonamici	Cicilline	DeGette
Boyle, Brendan	Clark (MA)	DeGette
F.	Clarke (NY)	Delaney
Brady (PA)	Clay	DeLauro
Brown (FL)	Cleaver	DelBene
Brownley (CA)	Clyburn	DeSaulnier
Bustos	Cohen	Deutch
Butterfield	Connolly	Dingell
Capps	Conyers	Doggett

Doyle, Michael F.
 Duckworth
 Edwards
 Ellison
 Engel
 Eshoo
 Esty
 Farr
 Foster
 Frankel (FL)
 Fudge
 Gabbard
 Gallego
 Garamendi
 Graham
 Grayson
 Green, Al
 Green, Gene
 Grijalva
 Gutiérrez
 Hahn
 Hastings
 Heck (WA)
 Higgins
 Himes
 Hinojosa
 Honda
 Hoyer
 Huffman
 Israel
 Jackson Lee
 Jeffries
 Johnson (GA)
 Johnson, E. B.
 Kaptur
 Keating
 Kelly (IL)
 Kennedy
 Kildee
 Kilmer
 Kind
 Kirkpatrick
 Kuster
 Langevin
 Larsen (WA)

NOT VOTING—7

Crenshaw
 Moore
 Poe (TX)

□ 1811

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

IRANIAN LEADERSHIP ASSET TRANSPARENCY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on passage of the bill (H.R. 5461) to require the Secretary of the Treasury to submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees on the estimated total assets under direct or indirect control by certain senior Iranian leaders and other figures, and for other purposes, 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 passage of the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 282, nays 143, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 536]

YEAS—282

Abraham
 Aderholt
 Aguilar
 Allen
 Amash
 Amodei
 Ashford

Babin
 Barletta
 Barr
 Barton
 Benishek
 Bera
 Bilirakis

Bishop (MI)
 Bishop (UT)
 Black
 Blackburn
 Blum
 Bost
 Boustany

Boyle, Brendan F.
 Brady (TX)
 Brat
 Bridenstine
 Brooks (AL)
 Brooks (IN)
 Brownley (CA)
 Buchanan
 Sarbanes
 Bucshon
 Burgess
 Byrne
 Calvert
 Cárdenas
 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)
 Davidson
 Davis, Rodney
 DeFazio
 Delaney
 Denham
 Dent
 DeSantis
 DesJarlais
 Deutch
 Diaz-Balart
 Dold
 Donovan
 Duffy
 Duncan (SC)
 Ellmers (NC)
 Emmer (MN)
 Engel
 Farenthold
 Fincher
 Fitzpatrick
 Fleischmann
 Fleming
 Flores
 Forbes
 Fortenberry
 Foxx
 Frankel (FL)
 Franks (AZ)
 Frelinghuysen
 Garrett
 Gibbs
 Gibson
 Gohmert
 Goodlatte
 Gosar
 Gowdy
 Graham
 Granger
 Graves (GA)
 Graves (LA)
 Graves (MO)
 Green, Gene
 Griffith
 Grothman
 Guinta
 Guthrie
 Hahn
 Hanna
 Hardy
 Harper
 Harris
 Hartzler
 Hastings
 Heck (NV)

NAYS—143

Adams
 Bass
 Beatty
 Becerra
 Beyer
 Bishop (GA)
 Blumenauer
 Bonamici
 Brady (PA)

Hensarling
 Herrera Beutler
 Hice, Jody B.
 Hill
 Holding
 Hoyer
 Hudson
 Huelskamp
 Huizenga (MI)
 Hultgren
 Hunter
 Hurd (TX)
 Hurt (VA)
 Israel
 Issa
 Jenkins (KS)
 Jenkins (WV)
 Johnson (OH)
 Johnson, Sam
 Jolly
 Jordan
 Joyce
 Katko
 Kelly (MS)
 Kelly (PA)
 King (IA)
 King (NY)
 Kinzinger (IL)
 Kirkpatrick
 Kline
 Knight
 Labrador
 LaHood
 LaMalfa
 Lamborn
 Lance
 Latta
 Lieu, Ted
 Lipinski
 LoBiondo
 Long
 Loudermilk
 Love
 Lowey
 Lucas
 Luetkemeyer
 Lummis
 Lynch
 MacArthur
 Maloney, Sean
 Marchant
 Marino
 Massie
 McCarthy
 McCaul
 McClintock
 McHenry
 McKinley
 McMorris
 Rodgers
 McSally
 Meadows
 Meehan
 Meng
 Messer
 Mica
 Miller (FL)
 Miller (MI)
 Moolenaar
 Mooney (WV)
 Mullin
 Mulvaney
 Murphy (PA)
 Neugebauer
 Newhouse
 Noem
 Norcross
 Nugent
 Nunes
 Olson
 Palazzo
 Palmer
 Paulsen
 Pearce
 Perry
 Peters
 Peterson
 Pittenger

Pitts
 Poliquin
 Pompeo
 Posey
 Price, Tom
 Quigley
 Ratcliffe
 Reed
 Reichert
 Renacci
 Ribble
 Rice (NY)
 Rice (SC)
 Rigell
 Doggett
 Doyle, Michael F.
 Duckworth
 Duncan (TN)
 Edwards
 Ellison
 Eshoo
 Esty
 Farr
 Foster
 Fudge
 Gabbard
 Gallego
 Garamendi
 Grayson
 Green, Al
 Grijalva
 Gutiérrez
 Heck (WA)
 Higgins
 Himes
 Hinojosa
 Honda
 Huffman
 Jackson Lee
 Jeffries

Moore
 Poe (TX)

Johnson (GA)
 Johnson, E. B.
 Jones
 Kaptur
 Keating
 Kelly (IL)
 Kennedy
 Kildee
 Kilmer
 Kind
 Kuster
 Langevin
 Larsen (WA)
 Larson (CT)
 Lawrence
 Lee
 Levin
 Lewis
 Loebsock
 Lofgren
 Lowenthal
 Lujan Grisham
 (NM)
 Luján, Ben Ray
 (NM)
 Maloney,
 Carolyn
 Matsui
 McCollum
 McDermott
 McGovern
 McNerney
 Meeks
 Moulton
 Murphy (FL)
 Nadler
 Napolitano
 Neal
 Nolan
 O'Rourke
 Pallone

NOT VOTING—6

Rush
 Sanchez, Loretta
 Tiberi
 Walters, Mimi

□ 1818

So the bill was passed.
 The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMUNITY COUNTERTERRORISM PREPAREDNESS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5859) to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish the major metropolitan area counterterrorism training and exercise grant program, and for other purposes, 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 Texas (Mr. MCCAUL) 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 395, nays 30, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 537]

YEAS—395

Abraham
 Adams
 Aguilar
 Allen
 Amodei
 Ashford
 Babin
 Barletta
 Barr
 Barton
 Bass

Beatty
 Becerra
 Benishek
 Bera
 Beyer
 Bilirakis
 Bishop (GA)
 Bishop (MI)
 Bishop (UT)
 Black
 Blackburn

Blum
 Blumenauer
 Bonamici
 Bost
 Boustany
 Boyle, Brendan F.
 Brady (PA)
 Brady (TX)
 Bridenstine
 Brooks (IN)

Perry	Sánchez, Linda	Trott	Amodei	Dingell	Kelly (IL)	Pelosi	Ryan (OH)	Tonko
Peters	T.	Tsongas	Ashford	Doggett	Kelly (MS)	Perlmutter	Salmon	Torres
Peterson	Sanford	Turner	Babin	Dold	Kelly (PA)	Perry	Sánchez, Linda	Trott
Pingree	Scarbanes	Upton	Barletta	Donovan	Kennedy	Peters	T.	Tsongas
Pittenger	Scalise	Valadao	Barr	Doyle, Michael	Kildee	Peterson	Sanford	Turner
Pitts	Schakowsky	Van Hollen	Barton	F.	Kilmer	Pingree	Scarbanes	Upton
Pocan	Schiff	Vargas	Bass	Duckworth	Kind	Pittenger	Scalise	Valadao
Poliquin	Schrader	Veasey	Beatty	Duffy	King (IA)	Pitts	Schakowsky	Van Hollen
Polis	Schweikert	Vela	Becerra	Duncan (SC)	King (NY)	Pocan	Schiff	Vargas
Pompeo	Scott (VA)	Velázquez	Benishek	Duncan (TN)	Kinzinger (IL)	Poliquin	Schrader	Veasey
Posey	Scott, Austin	Visclosky	Bera	Edwards	Kirkpatrick	Polis	Schweikert	Vela
Price (NC)	Scott, David	Wagner	Beyer	Ellison	Kline	Pompeo	Scott (VA)	Velázquez
Price, Tom	Sensenbrenner	Walberg	Bilirakis	Ellmers (NC)	Knight	Posey	Scott, Austin	Visclosky
Quigley	Serrano	Walden	Bishop (GA)	Emmer (MN)	Kuster	Price (NC)	Scott, David	Wagner
Rangel	Sessions	Walker	Bishop (MI)	Engel	Labrador	Price, Tom	Sensenbrenner	Walberg
Ratcliffe	Sewell (AL)	Walorski	Bishop (UT)	Eshoo	LaHood	Quigley	Serrano	Walden
Reed	Sherman	Walz	Black	Esty	LaMalfa	Rangel	Sessions	Walker
Reichert	Shimkus	Wasserman	Blackburn	Farenthold	Lamborn	Ratcliffe	Sewell (AL)	Walorski
Renacci	Shuster	Schultz	Blum	Farr	Lance	Reed	Sherman	Walz
Ribble	Simpson	Waters, Maxine	Blumenauer	Fincher	Langevin	Reichert	Shimkus	Wasserman
Rice (NY)	Sinema	Watson Coleman	Bonamici	Fitzpatrick	Larsen (WA)	Renacci	Shuster	Schultz
Rice (SC)	Sires	Weber (TX)	Bost	Fleischmann	Larson (CT)	Ribble	Simpson	Waters, Maxine
Richmond	Slaughter	Webster (FL)	Boustany	Fleming	Latta	Rice (NY)	Sinema	Watson Coleman
Rigell	Smith (MO)	Welch	Boyle, Brendan	Flores	Lawrence	Rice (SC)	Sires	Weber (TX)
Roby	Smith (NE)	Wenstrup	F.	Forbes	Lee	Richmond	Slaughter	Webster (FL)
Roe (TN)	Smith (NJ)	Westerman	Brady (PA)	Fortenberry	Levin	Rigell	Smith (MO)	Welch
Rogers (AL)	Smith (TX)	Westmoreland	Brady (TX)	Foster	Lewis	Roby	Smith (NE)	Wenstrup
Rogers (KY)	Smith (WA)	Williams	Brat	Foxx	Lieu, Ted	Roe (TN)	Smith (NJ)	Westerman
Rohrabacher	Speier	Wilson (FL)	Bridenstine	Frankel (FL)	Lipinski	Rogers (AL)	Smith (TX)	Westmoreland
Rokita	Stefanik	Wilson (SC)	Brooks (AL)	Franks (AZ)	LoBiondo	Rogers (KY)	Smith (WA)	Williams
Rooney (FL)	Stewart	Wittman	Brooks (IN)	Frelinghuysen	Loeback	Rohrabacher	Speier	Wilson (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen	Stivers	Womack	Brown (FL)	Fudge	Lofgren	Rokita	Stefanik	Wilson (SC)
Roskam	Stutzman	Woodall	Brownley (CA)	Gabbard	Long	Rooney (FL)	Stewart	Wittman
Ross	Swalwell (CA)	Yarmuth	Buchanan	Gallego	Loudermilk	Ros-Lehtinen	Stivers	Womack
Rothfus	Takano	Yoder	Buck	Garamendi	Love	Roskam	Stutzman	Woodall
Rouzer	Thompson (CA)	Yoho	Bucshon	Garrett	Lowenthal	Ross	Swalwell (CA)	Yarmuth
Roybal-Allard	Thompson (MS)	Young (AK)	Burgess	Gibbs	Lowe	Rothfus	Takano	Yoder
Royce	Thompson (PA)	Young (IA)	Bustos	Gibson	Lucas	Rouzer	Thompson (CA)	Yoho
Ruiz	Thornberry	Young (IN)	Butterfield	Gohmert	Luetkemeyer	Roybal-Allard	Thompson (MS)	Young (AK)
Ruppersberger	Tipton	Zeldin	Byrne	Goodlatte	Lujan Grisham	Royce	Thompson (PA)	Young (IA)
Russell	Titus	Zinke	Calvert	Gosar	(NM)	Ruiz	Thornberry	Young (IN)
Ryan (OH)	Tonko		Capps	Gowdy	Lujan, Ben Ray	Ruppersberger	Tipton	Zeldin
Salmon	Torres		Capuano	Graham	(NM)	Russell	Titus	Zinke

NOT VOTING—6

Moore	Rush	Tiberi
Poe (TX)	Sanchez, Loretta	Walters, Mimi

□ 1832

Mr. CONYERS changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DIRECTING THE SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION TO PROVIDE CONGRESS ADVANCE NOTICE OF CERTAIN ANNOUNCEMENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5977) to direct the Secretary of Transportation to provide to the appropriate committees of Congress advance notice of certain announcements, and for other purposes, 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 Missouri (Mr. GRAVES) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 424, nays 1, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 539]

YEAS—424

Abraham	Aderholt	Allen
Adams	Aguilar	Amash

NAYS—1

Huelskamp

NOT VOTING—6

Moore	Rush	Tiberi
Poe (TX)	Sanchez, Loretta	Walters, Mimi

□ 1839

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DIRECTING THE FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION TO ALLOW CERTAIN CONSTRUCTION OR ALTERATION OF STRUCTURES BY STATE DEPARTMENTS OF TRANSPORTATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 6014) to direct the Federal Aviation Administration to allow certain construction or alteration of structures by State departments of transportation without requiring an aeronautical study, and for other purposes, 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 New York (Mr. ZELDIN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 425, nays 0, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 540]

YEAS—425

Abraham DeLauro Jenkins (KS)
 Adams DelBene Jenkins (WV)
 Aderholt Denham Johnson (GA)
 Aguilar Dent Johnson (OH)
 Allen DeSantis Johnson, E. B.
 Amash DeSaulnier Johnson, Sam
 Amodei DesJarlais Jolly
 Ashford Deutch Jones
 Babin Diaz-Balart Jordan
 Barletta Dingell Joyce
 Barr Doggett Kaptur
 Barton Dold Katko
 Bass Donovan Keating
 Beatty Doyle, Michael Kelly (IL)
 Becerra F. Kelly (MS)
 Benishek Duckworth Kelly (PA)
 Bera Duffy Kennedy
 Beyer Duncan (SC) Kildee
 Bilirakis Duncan (TN) Kilmer
 Bishop (GA) Edwards Kind
 Bishop (MI) Ellison King (IA)
 Bishop (UT) Ellmers (NC) King (NY)
 Black Emmer (MN) Kinzinger (IL)
 Blackburn Engel Kirkpatrick
 Blum Eshoo Kline
 Blumenauer Esty Knight
 Bonamici Farenthold Kuster
 Bost Farr Labrador
 Boustany Fincher LaHood
 Boyle, Brendan Fitzpatrick LaMalfa
 F. Fleischmann Lamborn
 Brady (PA) Fleming Lance
 Brady (TX) Flores Langevin
 Brat Forbes Larsen (WA)
 Bridenstine Fortenberry Larson (CT)
 Brooks (AL) Foster Latta
 Brooks (IN) Foxx Lawrence
 Brown (FL) Frankel (FL) Lee
 Brownley (CA) Franks (AZ) Levin
 Buchanan Frelinghuysen Lewis
 Buck Fudge Lieu, Ted
 Bucshon Gabbard Lipinski
 Burgess Gallego LoBiondo
 Bustos Garamendi Loeb sack
 Butterfield Garrett Lofgren
 Byrne Gibbs Long
 Calvert Gibson Loudermilk
 Capps Gohmert Love
 Capuano Goodlatte Lowenthal
 Cárdenas Gosar Lowey
 Carney Gowdy Lucas
 Carson (IN) Graham Luetkemeyer
 Carter (GA) Granger Lujan Grisham
 Carter (TX) Graves (GA) (NM)
 Cartwright Graves (LA) Luján, Ben Ray
 Castor (FL) Graves (MO) (NM)
 Castro (TX) Grayson Lummis
 Chabot Green, Al Lynch
 Chaffetz Green, Gene MacArthur
 Chu, Judy Griffith Maloney,
 Cicilline Grijalva Carolyn
 Clark (MA) Grothman Maloney, Sean
 Clarke (NY) Guinta Marchant
 Clawson (FL) Guthrie Marino
 Clay Gutiérrez Massie
 Cleaver Hahn Matsui
 Clyburn Hanna McCarthy
 Coffman Hardy McCaul
 Cohen Harper McClintock
 Cole Harris McCollum
 Collins (GA) Hartzler McDermott
 Collins (NY) Hastings McGovern
 Comstock Heck (NV) McHenry
 Conaway Heck (WA) McKinley
 Connolly Hensarling McMorris
 Conyers Herrera Beutler Rodgers
 Cook Hice, Jody B. McNeerney
 Cooper Higgins McSally
 Costa Hill Meadows
 Costello (PA) Himes Meehan
 Courtney Hinojosa Meeks
 Cramer Holding Meng
 Crawford Honda Messer
 Crenshaw Hoyer Mica
 Crowley Hudson Miller (FL)
 Cuellar Huelskamp Miller (MI)
 Culberson Huffman Moolenaar
 Cummings Hui zenga (MI) Mooney (WV)
 Curbelo (FL) Hultgren Moulton
 Davidson Hunter Mullin
 Davis (CA) Hurd (TX) Mulvaney
 Davis, Danny Hurt (VA) Murphy (FL)
 Davis, Rodney Israel Murphy (PA)
 DeFazio Issa Nadler
 DeGette Jackson Lee Napolitano
 Delaney Jeffries Neal

Neugebauer
 Newhouse
 Noem
 Nolan
 Norcross
 Nugent
 Nunes
 O'Rourke
 Olson
 Palazzo
 Pallone
 Palmer
 Pascrell
 Paulsen
 Payne
 Pearce
 Pelosi
 Perlmutter
 Perry
 Peters
 Peterson
 Pingree
 Pittenger
 Pitts
 Pocan
 Poliquin
 Polis
 Pompeo
 Pomeo
 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)

Moore
 Poe (TX)

Ros-Lehtinen
 Roskam
 Ross
 Rothfus
 Rouzer
 Roybal-Allard
 Royce
 Ruiz
 Ruppertsberger
 Russell
 Ryan (OH)
 Salmon
 Sánchez, Linda
 T.
 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)

NOT VOTING—6

Rush
 Sanchez, Loretta
 Tiberi
 Walters, Mimi

□ 1845

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.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to allow the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration to enter into reimbursable agreements for certain airport projects."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BATHROOMS ACCESSIBLE IN EVERY SITUATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5147) to amend title 40, United States Code, to require that male and female restrooms in public buildings be equipped with baby changing facilities, 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 Pennsylvania (Mr. BARLETTA) 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 389, nays 34, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 541]

YEAS—389

Abraham Deutch Kildee
 Adams Diaz-Balart Kilmer
 Aderholt Kind
 Aguilar Doggett King (IA)
 Allen Dold King (NY)
 Amodei Donovan Kinzinger (IL)
 Ashford Doyle, Michael Kirkpatrick
 Babin F. Kline
 Barletta Duckworth Knight
 Barr Duffy Kuster
 Barton Duncan (TN) Labrador
 Bass Edwards LaHood
 Beatty Ellison LaMalfa
 Becerra Ellmers (NC) Lamborn
 Benishek Emmer (MN) Lance
 Bera Engel Langevin
 Beyer Eshoo Larsen (WA)
 Bilirakis Esty Latta
 Bishop (GA) Farr Lawrence
 Bishop (MI) Fincher Lee
 Bishop (UT) Fitzpatrick Levin
 Black Fleischmann Lewis
 Blackburn Fleming Lieu, Ted
 Blum Flores Lipinski
 Blumenauer Forbes LoBiondo
 Bonamici Fortenberry Loeb sack
 Bost Foster Lofgren
 Boustany Foxx Long
 Boyle, Brendan Frankel (FL) Love
 F. Franks (AZ) Lowenthal
 Brady (PA) Frelinghuysen Lowey
 Brady (TX) Fudge Lucas
 Bridenstine Gabbard Luetkemeyer
 Brooks (IN) Brooks (IN) Gallego
 Brown (FL) Brown (FL) Garamendi
 Brownley (CA) Brownley (CA) Garrett
 Buchanan Buchanan Gibbon
 Buck Gohmert Lynch
 Bucshon Bucshon Goodlatte
 Burgess Gallego Gowdy
 Bustos Garamendi Graham
 Butterfield Garrett Maloney, Sean
 Byrne Gibbs Long
 Calvert Gibson Loudermilk
 Capps Gohmert Love
 Capuano Goodlatte Lowenthal
 Cárdenas Gosar Lowey
 Carney Gowdy Lucas
 Carson (IN) Graham Luetkemeyer
 Carter (GA) Granger Lujan Grisham
 Carter (TX) Graves (GA) (NM)
 Cartwright Graves (LA) Luján, Ben Ray
 Castor (FL) Graves (MO) (NM)
 Castro (TX) Grayson Lummis
 Chabot Green, Al Lynch
 Chaffetz Green, Gene MacArthur
 Chu, Judy Griffith Maloney,
 Cicilline Grijalva Carolyn
 Clark (MA) Grothman Maloney, Sean
 Clarke (NY) Guinta Marchant
 Clawson (FL) Guthrie Marino
 Clay Gutiérrez Massie
 Cleaver Hahn Matsui
 Clyburn Hanna McCarthy
 Coffman Hardy McCaul
 Cohen Harper McClintock
 Cole Harris McCollum
 Collins (GA) Hartzler McDermott
 Collins (NY) Hastings McGovern
 Comstock Heck (NV) McHenry
 Conaway Heck (WA) McKinley
 Connolly Hensarling McMorris
 Conyers Herrera Beutler Rodgers
 Cook Hice, Jody B. McNeerney
 Cooper Higgins McSally
 Costa Hill Meadows
 Costello (PA) Himes Meehan
 Courtney Hinojosa Meeks
 Cramer Holding Meng
 Crawford Honda Messer
 Crenshaw Hoyer Mica
 Crowley Hudson Miller (FL)
 Cuellar Huelskamp Miller (MI)
 Culberson Huffman Moolenaar
 Cummings Hui zenga (MI) Mooney (WV)
 Curbelo (FL) Hultgren Moulton
 Davidson Hunter Mullin
 Davis (CA) Hurd (TX) Mulvaney
 Davis, Danny Hurt (VA) Murphy (FL)
 Davis, Rodney Israel Murphy (PA)
 DeFazio Issa Nadler
 DeGette Jackson Lee Napolitano
 Delaney Jeffries Neal

Pocan	Scalise	Trott
Poliquin	Schakowsky	Tsongas
Polis	Schiff	Turner
Pompeo	Schrader	Upton
Posey	Schweikert	Valadao
Price (NC)	Scott (VA)	Van Hollen
Price, Tom	Scott, Austin	Vargas
Quigley	Scott, David	Veasey
Rangel	Sensenbrenner	Vela
Ratcliffe	Serrano	Velazquez
Reed	Sessions	Visclosky
Reichert	Sewell (AL)	Wagner
Renacci	Sherman	Walberg
Ribble	Shimkus	Walden
Rice (NY)	Shuster	Walker
Rice (SC)	Simpson	Walorski
Richmond	Sinema	Walz
Rigell	Sires	Wasserman
Roby	Slaughter	Schultz
Roe (TN)	Smith (MO)	Watson Coleman
Rogers (AL)	Smith (NE)	Webster (FL)
Rogers (KY)	Smith (NJ)	Welch
Rooney (FL)	Smith (TX)	Wenstrup
Ros-Lehtinen	Smith (WA)	Westerman
Roskam	Speier	Williams
Ross	Stefanik	Wilson (FL)
Rothfus	Stewart	Wilson (SC)
Rouzer	Stivers	Wittman
Roybal-Allard	Swalwell (CA)	Womack
Royce	Takano	Woodall
Ruiz	Thompson (CA)	Yarmuth
Ruppersberger	Thompson (MS)	Yoder
Russell	Thompson (PA)	Young (IA)
Ryan (OH)	Tipton	Young (IN)
Sánchez, Linda	Titus	Zeldin
T.	Tonko	
Sarbanes	Torres	

NAYS—34

Amash	Grothman	Rokita
Brat	Harris	Salmon
Brooks (AL)	Hice, Jody B.	Sanford
Burgess	Huelskamp	Stutzman
Chaffetz	Jones	Thornberry
Clawson (FL)	Loudermilk	Weber (TX)
Collins (GA)	Lummis	Westmoreland
Duncan (SC)	Massie	Yoho
Farenthold	McClintock	Young (AK)
Gibbs	Mulvaney	Zinke
Gosar	Perry	
Griffith	Rohrabacher	

NOT VOTING—8

Larson (CT)	Rush	Walters, Mimi
Moore	Sanchez, Loretta	Waters, Maxine
Poe (TX)	Tiberi	

□ 1851

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.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend title 40, United States Code, to require restrooms in public buildings to be equipped with baby changing facilities."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall Nos. 535 (on passage of H.R. 3438), 536 (on passage of H.R. 5461), 537 (motion to suspend the rules and pass, as amended H.R. 5859), 538 (motion to suspend the rules and pass, as amended H.R. 6007), 539 (motion to suspend the rules and pass, as amended H.R. 5977), 540 (motion to suspend the rules and pass, as amended H.R. 6014), and 541 (motion to suspend the rules and pass, as amended H.R. 5147) I did not cast my votes due to illness. Had I been present. I would have voted "yea" on all of the votes.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RATCLIFFE). Pursuant to clause 8 of

rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on additional motions 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 votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

MOBILE WORKFORCE STATE INCOME TAX SIMPLIFICATION ACT OF 2015

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2315) to limit the authority of States to tax certain income of employees for employment duties performed in other States.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2315

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 "Mobile Workforce State Income Tax Simplification Act of 2015".

SEC. 2. LIMITATIONS ON STATE WITHHOLDING AND TAXATION OF EMPLOYEE INCOME.

(a) IN GENERAL.—No part of the wages or other remuneration earned by an employee who performs employment duties in more than one State shall be subject to income tax in any State other than—

(1) the State of the employee's residence; and

(2) the State within which the employee is present and performing employment duties for more than 30 days during the calendar year in which the wages or other remuneration is earned.

(b) WAGES OR OTHER REMUNERATION.—Wages or other remuneration earned in any calendar year shall not be subject to State income tax withholding and reporting requirements unless the employee is subject to income tax in such State under subsection (a). Income tax withholding and reporting requirements under subsection (a)(2) shall apply to wages or other remuneration earned as of the commencement date of employment duties in the State during the calendar year.

(c) OPERATING RULES.—For purposes of determining penalties related to an employer's State income tax withholding and reporting requirements—

(1) an employer may rely on an employee's annual determination of the time expected to be spent by such employee in the States in which the employee will perform duties absent—

(A) the employer's actual knowledge of fraud by the employee in making the determination; or

(B) collusion between the employer and the employee to evade tax;

(2) except as provided in paragraph (3), if records are maintained by an employer in the regular course of business that record the location of an employee, such records shall not preclude an employer's ability to rely on an employee's determination under paragraph (1); and

(3) notwithstanding paragraph (2), if an employer, at its sole discretion, maintains a time and attendance system that tracks where the employee performs duties on a daily basis, data from the time and attendance system shall be used instead of the employee's determination under paragraph (1).

(d) DEFINITIONS AND SPECIAL RULES.—For purposes of this Act:

(1) DAY.—

(A) Except as provided in subparagraph (B), an employee is considered present and performing employment duties within a State for a day if the employee performs more of the employee's employment duties within such State than in any other State during a day.

(B) If an employee performs employment duties in a resident State and in only one nonresident State during one day, such employee shall be considered to have performed more of the employee's employment duties in the nonresident State than in the resident State for such day.

(C) For purposes of this paragraph, the portion of the day during which the employee is in transit shall not be considered in determining the location of an employee's performance of employment duties.

(2) EMPLOYEE.—The term "employee" has the same meaning given to it by the State in which the employment duties are performed, except that the term "employee" shall not include a professional athlete, professional entertainer, or certain public figures.

(3) PROFESSIONAL ATHLETE.—The term "professional athlete" means a person who performs services in a professional athletic event, provided that the wages or other remuneration are paid to such person for performing services in his or her capacity as a professional athlete.

(4) PROFESSIONAL ENTERTAINER.—The term "professional entertainer" means a person who performs services in the professional performing arts for wages or other remuneration on a per-event basis, provided that the wages or other remuneration are paid to such person for performing services in his or her capacity as a professional entertainer.

(5) CERTAIN PUBLIC FIGURES.—The term "certain public figures" means persons of prominence who perform services for wages or other remuneration on a per-event basis, provided that the wages or other remuneration are paid to such person for services provided at a discrete event, in the nature of a speech, public appearance, or similar event.

(6) EMPLOYER.—The term "employer" has the meaning given such term in section 3401(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (26 U.S.C. 3401(d)), unless such term is defined by the State in which the employee's employment duties are performed, in which case the State's definition shall prevail.

(7) STATE.—The term "State" means any of the several States.

(8) TIME AND ATTENDANCE SYSTEM.—The term "time and attendance system" means a system in which—

(A) the employee is required on a contemporaneous basis to record his work location for every day worked outside of the State in which the employee's employment duties are primarily performed; and

(B) the system is designed to allow the employer to allocate the employee's wages for income tax purposes among all States in which the employee performs employment duties for such employer.

(9) WAGES OR OTHER REMUNERATION.—The term "wages or other remuneration" may be limited by the State in which the employment duties are performed.

SEC. 3. EFFECTIVE DATE; APPLICABILITY.

(a) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This Act shall take effect on January 1 of the 2d year that begins after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) APPLICABILITY.—This Act shall not apply to any tax obligation that accrues before the effective date of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from

Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 2315, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

The Mobile Workforce State Income Tax Simplification Act provides a clear, uniform framework for when States may tax nonresident employees who travel to the taxing State to perform work. In particular, this bill prevents States from imposing income tax compliance burdens on nonresidents who work in a foreign State for fewer than 30 days in a year.

The State tax laws that determine when a nonresident must pay a foreign State's income tax and when employers must withhold this tax are numerous and varied. Some States tax income earned within their borders by nonresidents even if the employee only works in the State for just 1 day. These complicated rules impact everyone who travels for work and many industries.

As just one example, the Judiciary Committee heard testimony in 2015 that the patchwork of State laws resulted in a manufacturing company issuing 50 W-2s to a single employee for a single year. The company executive also noted, regarding the compliance burden: many of our affected employees make less than \$50,000 per year and have limited resources to seek professional advice.

States generally allow a credit for income taxes paid to another State. However, it is not always dollar for dollar when local taxes are factored in. Credits also do not relieve workers of substantial paperwork burdens.

There are substantial burdens on employers as well. The committee heard testimony in 2014 that businesses, including small businesses, that operate interstate are subject to significant regulatory burdens with regard to compliance with nonresident State income tax withholding laws. These burdens distract from productive activity and job creation.

Nevertheless, some object that the States will lose revenue if the bill is enacted. However, an analysis from Ernst & Young found that the bill's revenue impact is minimal.

There is little motive for fraud and gaming because the amount of money at issue—taxes on less than 30 days' wages—is minimal. Also, the income tax generally has to be paid; the question is merely to whom.

I commend the bill's lead sponsors, Representatives BISHOP and JOHNSON, and thank all of the bill's cosponsors. I urge the bill's passage.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time, and I ask unanimous consent to yield control of my time to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BISHOP).

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

There was no objection.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS).

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 2315.

A large and broad coalition of 11 large labor and tax organizations all oppose this bill because it is an attempt to impose standardized criteria for a uniform framework for the tax treatment of out-of-state residents, would cause certain States to lose massive State income tax revenues, and would facilitate tax liability avoidance through manipulation by employers and employees alike.

It achieves this flawed result in several ways. To begin with, rather than promoting uniformity, H.R. 2315 would have a significant adverse impact on income tax revenues for certain States.

According to the Congressional Budget Office, for example, as the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) will explain, New York could lose between \$50 million and \$125 million annually if this measure were signed into law. Other States that would also be adversely impacted and affected include Illinois, Massachusetts, and California.

As a result of the lost revenues from nonresident taxpayers, these States would be forced to make up these losses by shifting the tax burden to resident taxpayers. It may even cause these States to cut government services, such as funding for education and critical infrastructure improvements.

Another problem with H.R. 2315 is that it essentially provides a roadmap for State income tax liability avoidance.

□ 1900

By allowing an employer to rely on an employee's determination of the time he or she is expected to spend working in another State during the year, the bill prevents the employer from withholding an employee's State income taxes to a nonresident State.

This would be the result even if the employer is aware that the employee has been working in a State for more than 30 days, as long as that State cannot prove that the employee committed fraud in making his annual determination and the employer knew it.

Rather than proceeding with this flawed bill, I urge my colleagues to pass a fair and uniform framework to allow States to collect taxes owed on remote sales. By staying silent since the Supreme Court's 1992 Quill decision, the Congress has failed to ensure

that States have the authority to collect sales and use tax on Internet purchases. I am disappointed that, rather than moving the bipartisan eFairness legislation that our communities need, we are considering this measure instead.

For these concerns and other reasons, I hope that you will join me in opposing H.R. 2315.

Mr. BISHOP of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to address my colleagues regarding my bipartisan, bicameral, H.R. 2315, the Mobile Workforce State Income Tax Simplification Act.

Mr. Speaker, according to the 10th Amendment, States are generally free to set their own public policy. It is important, however, that they do so in a way that does not place a substantial burden upon the Commerce Clause of the United States Constitution.

As the American workforce becomes increasingly more mobile, Congress has the constitutional duty to ensure that State public policy does not interfere with interstate economic activity.

As an attorney and businessowner, I have seen firsthand how complicated all these different State income tax laws are for those who travel and work. These burdens affect small businesses in particular, as well as their employees, because they simply do not have the resources to comply with all the varying State income tax requirements that exist today.

Employees are currently being punished with complex reporting standards and the expense that results from filing all of this paperwork simply because they must travel outside their home State for work. And rather than expanding payroll or reducing prices for consumer goods, businesses are being forced to spend their hard-earned and scarce resources on complying with convoluted State income tax laws. This certainly fits the definition, in my opinion, of government red tape.

During the subcommittee hearing on my bill last year, one witness testified that his employer had filed 10,500 W-2s on behalf of their numerous employees, primarily because they had crossed State lines for work. He went on to tell us that one of his coworkers had to file 50 W-2s just for himself.

Imagine an individual making less than \$50,000 a year having to file 50, 20, or even 10 W-2s. It is simply unacceptable to place that burden on our workforce today, and, moreover, it is unacceptable for us to let it go unresolved any longer.

The Constitution grants Congress the authority to enact laws to protect the free flow of commerce among the States. It is imperative that Congress respects the 10th Amendment, but States must not use that power to prey upon workers from different States simply to raise revenues.

That said, the complex array of State income tax laws in this Nation deserve

a serious overhaul, and that is why conservative states' rights legislative groups such as the American Legislative Exchange Council agree and support this legislation, specifically identifying H.R. 2315 as the type of interstate commerce regulation Congress should enact. In fact, that is why more than 300 outside organizations, to date, have pledged their support for this bill.

With the help of my colleague, Representative HANK JOHNSON, on the other side of the aisle, our Mobile Workforce State Income Tax Simplification Act is a carefully crafted, bipartisan, bicameral measure that streamlines income tax laws across the Nation. It creates a uniform 30-day threshold before which a nonresident cannot be exposed to another State's income tax liability. This ensures employees will have a clear understanding of their tax liability, and it gives employers a clear and consistent rule so that they can plan and accurately withhold taxes, knowing that the same rule applies for all States with an income tax. And best of all, it means much less paperwork and reduced compliance costs for everyone involved—businessowners and employees.

The goal of H.R. 2315 is to protect our mobile workforce, and that includes traveling emergency workers, first responders, trade union workers, non-profit staff, teachers, and Federal, State, and local government employees. Any organization that has employees that cross State lines for temporary periods will benefit from this law.

I would also note that great care was taken with this bill to diminish the impact on State revenues. My colleague across the aisle suggested concerns with this, and I would point out that a 2015 study the chairman raised earlier, conducted by Ernst & Young, found that H.R. 2315 would actually raise tax revenues in some States, while other States would only see a de minimis change.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to thank the 308 members of the Mobile Workforce Coalition who support the bill. I want to thank Chairman GOODLATTE for all of his time and effort, all 180 of my colleagues who have cosponsored this House bill, as well as Senator THUNE, Senator BROWN, and nearly half of the United States Senate that have cosponsored our companion bill so far.

The Mobile Workforce State Income Tax Simplification Act is a simple way to reduce obvious administrative burdens with so much red tape interwoven in today's Tax Code. This bill is just a plain commonsense way to cut through the clutter and simplify part of the filing process moving forward.

Together, we can make our workforce a priority and help our small businesses grow and save. I strongly urge my colleagues to pass H.R. 2315.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 2315. This bill represents a major assault on the sovereignty of the States, and does particular damage to my home State of New York, depriving it of more than \$100 million of its own tax revenue. The Mobile Workforce State Income Tax Simplification Act would prohibit States from collecting income tax from an individual unless the person works more than 30 days in that State in a calendar year.

Simplifying and harmonizing the rules on tax collection across the country is a worthy goal, but this bill would block States from setting their own tax policy within their own borders. That is both highly questionable, as a matter of constitutional law, and deeply troubling, as a matter of policy.

The power to tax is a key index of sovereignty, yet this legislation tells States they may not tax activity solely within their borders except as prescribed in the bill. I find this constitutionally dubious. Although I take a broad view generally of the Commerce Clause, I do not think it extends to a State's ability to tax a person doing business within its own borders.

Setting aside that concern, however, this bill would do great harm to a number of States, most especially to New York. According to some estimates, New York State could lose up to \$125 million annually if this bill were enacted.

New York City's unique location as the center of commerce for the Nation as well as its physical proximity to two other States means that many individuals go there throughout the year for business purposes. But if you work fewer than 30 days, which is up to six 5-day workweeks, this bill would strip New York of its right to tax any of your business activity within its borders. That is both grossly unfair and extremely costly. While a de minimis exception might make sense, I hardly think that 6 weeks and \$125 million is de minimis.

This bill comes at a time when Congress is intent on shifting more and more responsibilities to the States. As States continue to struggle with budgets that are stretched ever thinner, we should not further limit their authority to tax and deprive them of yet more revenue. The fiscal impact of this bill on certain States may be quite minimal but, on others like New York, it would be catastrophic. If we deprive a State of \$125 million each year, vital services like education, law enforcement, and health care could all be on the chopping block.

During consideration of H.R. 2315 in the Judiciary Committee, I offered two amendments that would have mitigated its impact. The first would have reduced the bill's 30-day threshold to a more reasonable 14 days, which is still almost 3 weeks of work without being subject to taxation. The other would have added highly paid individuals to the bill's list of exemptions, which would help avoid loopholes that could

allow wealthy people to escape millions of dollars of taxation.

Had my amendments been accepted, the expected impact on New York would have been reduced from more than \$100 million to roughly \$20 million a year. While still causing a significant drain on resources, these amendments would have gone a long way toward making the bill fairer, while still achieving its underlying goals. Unfortunately, they were defeated and, therefore, I must oppose the bill.

When the gentleman speaks of a company with 50 W-2 forms for one employee, if those W-2 forms total a few million dollars, that is not very burdensome. If they are for \$50,000, I understand the point. My amendment would have taken care of that.

I should note that this is not just about New York and that several other States would be similarly affected by this legislation. In addition, the bill is opposed by a broad coalition of labor and tax organizations, including the AFL-CIO, AFSCME, SEIU, the International Union of Police Associations, the Federation of Tax Administrators, the Multistate Tax Commission, and many others.

We should not be depriving States of the ability to tax within their own borders as we are transferring more functions to the States and cutting back on Federal spending. I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing this unfair and misguided legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, in response to the previous speaker, my colleague from across the aisle, I would respectfully respond to his concerns about states' rights. This bill does not violate federalism principles. On the contrary, it is an exercise of Congress' Commerce Clause authority in precisely the situation for which it was intended.

The Supreme Court has explained that the Commerce Clause was informed by structural concerns about the effects of State regulation on the national economy. Under the Articles of Confederation, State taxes and duties hindered and suppressed interstate commerce. The Framers intended the interstate Commerce Clause as a cure for these structural ills. This bill fits squarely within the authority by bringing uniformity to cases of de minimis presence by interstate workers in order to reduce compliance costs.

I might also say, Mr. Speaker, in regard to this bill, this bill enjoys broad bipartisan support. It has 180 cosponsors from both sides of the aisle. This bill will minimize compliance burdens on both workers and employers so that they can get back to being productive, creating and performing jobs. We have received letters of support from hundreds of entities across the employment spectrum.

But this bill is not just about business; it is about individuals.

One businessowner told the Judiciary Committee that the compliance burdens from the patchwork of State laws falls on the employees who “make less than \$50,000 per year and have limited resources to seek professional advice.”

□ 1915

It may not seem like a lot to those who oppose this bill, but for folks that make that kind of money, it is a great burden.

It has been questioned whether there will be revenue loss to these States. Analysis shows that the impact is minimal, affecting mainly the allocation of revenues, not the overall size of the tax revenue pot.

This legislation is a great example of Congress working in a bipartisan way to relieve burdens on hardworking Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to support the bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2315, the Mobile Workforce State Income Tax Simplification Act of 2015, which is an important bipartisan bill that will help workers and small businesses across the country.

As a proud sponsor of this legislation in both the 110th and 111th Congresses, I am very familiar with this issue.

H.R. 2315 would provide for a uniform and easily administrable law that will simplify the patchwork of existing inconsistent and confusing State rules. It would also reduce administrative costs to the States and lessen compliance burdens on consumers.

From a national perspective, the mobile workforce bill will vastly simplify the patchwork of existing inconsistent and confusing State rules. It would also reduce administrative costs to States and lessen compliance burdens on consumers.

Take my home State of Georgia as an example. If an Atlanta-based employee of a St. Louis company travels to headquarters on a business trip once a year, that employee would be subject to Missouri tax, even if his annual visit only lasts a day. However, if that employee travels to Maine, her trip would only be subject to tax if her trip lasts for 10 days. If she travels to New Mexico on business, she would only be subject to tax if she was in the State for 15 days.

For example, in Georgia, Acuity Brands is a leading lighting manufacturer that employs over 1,000 associates and has over 3,200 associates nationwide who travel extensively across the country for training, conferences, and other business.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter in support of H.R. 2315.

ACUITY BRANDS,

Conyers, GA, September 19, 2016.

Re H.R. 2315, the Mobile Workforce State Income Tax Simplification Act.

Hon. HANK JOHNSON,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE JOHNSON: We are writing to express our strong support for H.R. 2315, the Mobile Workforce State Income Tax Simplification Act, and urge you to support the legislation when the bill is considered by the House this week.

H.R. 2315, which would establish unified, clear rules and definitions for nonresident personal income tax reporting and withholding, is supported by 300+ organizations comprising the Mobile Workforce Coalition, and has over 170 bipartisan co-sponsors. The bill was approved by the House Judiciary Committee in June 2015, and a nearly identical version of the legislation was passed by voice vote in the House during the 112th Congress (H.R. 1864).

Acuity Brands, Inc. is one of the leading manufacturers of lighting and controls equipment in the world. We are a U.S. corporation based in Georgia with offices, manufacturing facilities, and training centers across the United States. We employ over 4,000 associates in the United States, and our fiscal year 2015 net sales totaled over \$2.7 billion.

Acuity Brands is a large multinational company with locations in many states and customers in all 50 states, which requires a large number of our associates to travel outside of their respective states of residency in order to properly manage and grow our business. Our associates travel all over the country for training, conferences, intracompany business, and volunteer activities for communities or non-for-profit entities. Many of these activities contribute to the economy of those non-resident states. Our associates, some of the country's foremost experts on matters impacting the lighting industry, also travel at the invitation of state legislators and regulators to provide testimony and technical expertise on energy-related issues.

Given the extensive travel required of our associates, some of which is done at the behest of others, the current state-by-state system of nonresident personal income tax reporting and withholding imposes substantial operational and administrative burdens on Acuity Brands and our associates. The current requirements vary by state and are often changing, which presents significant compliance challenges. Furthermore, state laws are not always clear on what constitutes work travel or work days, or what exclusions apply. Thus, significant resources are expended trying to interpret various states' requirements and then attempting to satisfy them.

H.R. 2315 would simplify the current system and greatly reduce the burden on Acuity Brands and other businesses. Unified, simple rules and definitions for nonresident reporting and withholding obligations would undoubtedly improve compliance rates and it would strike the correct balance between state sovereignty and ensuring that America's modern mobile workforce is not unduly encumbered.

In light of the foregoing, we would sincerely appreciate your support on this legislation.

Thank you very much for your consideration.

Sincerely,

CHERYL ENGLISH,

*VP, Government & Industry Relations,
Acuity Brands.*

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. In a letter, Richard Reece, Acuity's executive vice president, writes that current State

laws are numerous, varied, and often changing, requiring that the company expend significant resources merely interpreting and satisfying States' requirements.

He concludes that:

Unified, clear rules and definitions for nonresident reporting and withholding obligations would undoubtedly improve compliance rates, and it would strike the correct balance between State sovereignty and ensuring that America's modern mobile workforce is not unduly encumbered.

We should heed the calls of Acuity and numerous other businesses across the country by enacting H.R. 2315 into law. With over 175 cosponsors this Congress, it is clear that mobile workforce is an idea whose time has come.

I thank my colleagues for their work on the bill, and, in particular, Congressman BISHOP of Michigan for his leadership on this bill in the 114th Congress; also Chairman GOODLATTE for allowing this bill to come to the floor. Congressman BISHOP has carried the torch for our esteemed former colleague, the late Howard Coble, who fought alongside me in support of this bill when it passed out of the House by a voice vote in the 112th Congress.

I also thank our staffs who have worked tirelessly to build support for this legislation along bipartisan lines. This bill is a testament to the good that can come from working across the aisle on bipartisan tax fairness reforms.

I am optimistic that the passage of H.R. 2315 augers well for the passage of e-fairness legislation, which is critical to countless small businesses across the country this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I urge my colleagues in the Senate to bring this bill up for a vote as soon as possible. This country's employees and businesses deserve quick action.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York has 7½ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. Speaker, whatever the gentleman may say, the fact is this bill, since it deals only with earnings earned completely within a State, represents a major assault on the sovereignty of the States. It is one thing to say that interstate commerce must be regulated, that the State's ability to extend its tax out, its tax through a company without much nexus to the State that sells into the State can be regulated, but that is not this.

What this says is: We are going to limit the State's ability to tax economic activity that occurs entirely within the State.

Now, one might argue that if someone only spends a couple days in the State, you shouldn't tax that because it will discourage doing business in the State; and maybe if I were still a member of the State legislature, maybe I

would argue that. But that is an argument for the State legislature. It is not an argument for Congress. That is an argument on the economic merits of the State's exercise of its own tax powers and its own judgment within its own borders. For Congress to step in and say: New York must forgo \$125 million in revenue or some other State must forgo \$55 million or maybe \$22.38 entirely based on economic activity within that State is, frankly, none of our business.

Today we talk about the burden that this imposes. Yes, a State might be wise to exempt small amounts of income so you don't need 50 W-2s to someone who earns a total of \$50,000, but for someone who earns \$50 million and may earn \$20 million in a couple of days in a State, that State ought to be able to tax it, and it ought to be up to the economic and political judgment of that State as to how, in the interests of economic intelligence, to limit its exercise of its taxing power so as not to discourage business. That is a State's decision.

We hear a lot of rhetoric about States' rights and sovereignty and yielding power to the States on the floor, but here is an example going much farther than anything else I have seen, frankly, of the Federal Government stepping in and saying to a State: You may not exercise your taxing power within your State when it has nothing to do with another State.

If someone comes into the State and earns \$50 million in 10 days or 3 weeks or 4½ weeks, why shouldn't that State be able to tax it if it wishes to? By what right does Congress tell it that it can't? By what right does Congress tell New York: You must forgo \$100 to \$125 million in revenue?

Even the efficiency argument doesn't make much sense with today's computers and computer ability.

So I think that this is an invasion of States' rights. It is an invasion of the core ability of the State to tax within its own borders. It is an invasion of—it is not a theft—it is a deprivation, my own State is about \$125 million, which our taxpayers will have to make up, and it is wrong for that reason.

Now, I understand why ALEC might support this bill. ALEC wants government to do nothing, wants the Federal Government not to tax, the State governments not to tax, and have as little power as possible. That is a view, but it is not a view that justifies the Federal Government telling a State and telling the States' voters that, whether they like it or not, they shouldn't tax economic activity within that State, they should come up with the money some other way or they should have less State services. That is for the States' taxpayers, the States' voters to decide.

This bill is an imposition on the people of the States. It is wrong.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 9½ minutes remaining.

Mr. BISHOP of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, before I came to the United States Congress, I served as general counsel and chief legal officer for a small business. One of my primary functions was to ensure compliance on the patchwork of government requirements and issues that presented itself every day. It was a huge burden for our company. It was a huge burden for the employees of our company.

This is exactly what we are talking about today. This is the exact kind of compliance that is choking out small business and really, really falling on the shoulders of those who can least afford it.

Mr. Speaker, this is a commonsense solution to a real problem. We live in a global economy. It is something we can't deny. Our mobile workforce is there, and it is going to continue to grow. We cannot continue to penalize companies and individuals for that fact.

We have 180 cosponsors for this that accede the exact basis for what we are trying to accomplish here. These are bipartisan folks—Republicans and Democrats. The same is true with a companion bill in the Senate. There are lots and lots of outside groups that support it, not just specific legislative groups, but businesses that deal with this every day.

So I am very proud of this bill. I am grateful to Representative JOHNSON of Georgia for his work on the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support the bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BISHOP) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2315.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROTECTION OF THE RIGHT OF TRIBES TO STOP THE EXPORT OF CULTURAL AND TRADITIONAL PATRIMONY RESOLUTION

Mr. BISHOP of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 122) supporting efforts to stop the theft, illegal possession or sale, transfer, and export of tribal cultural items of American Indians, Alaska Natives, and Native Hawaiians in the United States and internationally, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 122

Whereas this resolution may be cited as the "Protection of the Right of Tribes to

stop the Export of Cultural and Traditional Patrimony Resolution" or the "PROTECT Patrimony Resolution";

Whereas the tribal cultural items of American Indians, Alaska Natives, and Native Hawaiians (collectively "tribes" or "Native Americans") in the United States of America include ancestral remains; funerary objects; sacred objects; and objects of cultural patrimony (hereinafter "tribal cultural items"), which are objects that have ongoing historical, traditional, or cultural importance central to a Native American group or culture itself, and which, therefore, cannot be alienated, appropriated, or conveyed by any individual;

Whereas tribal cultural items are vital to tribal cultural survival and the maintenance of tribal ways of life;

Whereas the nature and the description of tribal cultural items are sensitive and to be treated with respect and confidentiality, as appropriate;

Whereas violators often export tribal cultural items overseas with the intent of evading Federal and tribal laws;

Whereas tribal cultural items continue to be removed from tribal possession and sold in black or public markets in violation of Federal and tribal laws, including laws designed to protect tribal cultural property rights;

Whereas the illegal trade of tribal cultural items involves a sophisticated and lucrative black market, as items make their way through domestic markets, and then are often exported overseas;

Whereas auction houses in foreign countries have held sales of tribal cultural items from the Pueblo of Acoma, the Pueblo of Laguna, the Pueblo of San Felipe, the Hopi Tribe, and other tribes;

Whereas after tribal cultural items are exported abroad, tribes have difficulty stopping the sale of these items and securing their repatriation to their home communities, where the items belong;

Whereas Federal agencies have a responsibility to consult with tribes to stop the theft, illegal possession or sale, transfer, and export of tribal cultural items;

Whereas an increase in the investigation and successful prosecution of violations of the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (25 U.S.C. 3001 et seq.) and the Archaeological Resources Protection Act (16 U.S.C. 470aa-470mm) is necessary to deter illegal traders; and

Whereas many tribes and tribal organizations have passed resolutions condemning the theft and sale of tribal cultural items, including—

(1) the National Congress of American Indians passed Resolutions SAC-12-008 and SD-15-075 to call upon the United States, in consultation with tribes, to address international repatriation and take affirmative actions to stop the theft and illegal sale of tribal cultural items both domestically and abroad;

(2) the All Pueblo Council of Governors, representative of 20 Pueblo Indian tribes, noting that the Pueblo Indian tribes of the southwestern United States have been disproportionately affected by the illegal sale of tribal cultural items both domestically and internationally and in violation of Federal and tribal laws, passed Resolutions Nos. 2015-12 and 2015-13 to call upon the United States, in consultation with tribes, to address international repatriation and take affirmative actions to stop the theft and illegal sale of tribal cultural items both domestically and abroad;

(3) the United South and Eastern Tribes, an intertribal organization comprised of twenty-six federally recognized tribes, passed Resolution No. 2015:007, which calls

upon the United States to address all means to support repatriation of ancestral remains and cultural items from beyond United States borders; and

(4) the Inter-Tribal Council of the Five Civilized Tribes, uniting the Chickasaw, Choctaw, Cherokee, Muscogee (Creek), and Seminole Nations, passed Resolution No. 12-07, which requests that the United States assist in international repatriations and take immediate action, after consultation with tribes, to address repatriation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That Congress—

(1) condemns the theft, illegal possession or sale, transfer, and export of tribal cultural items;

(2) calls upon the Secretaries of the Department of the Interior, the Department of State, the Department of Commerce, and the Department of Homeland Security and the Attorney General to consult with tribes and traditional Native American religious leaders in addressing this important issue, to take affirmative action to stop these illegal practices, and to secure repatriation of tribal cultural items to tribes;

(3) supports the development of explicit restrictions on the export of tribal cultural items; and

(4) encourages State and local governments and interested groups and organizations to work cooperatively in deterring the theft, illegal possession or sale, transfer, and export of tribal cultural items and in securing the repatriation of tribal cultural items.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BISHOP) and the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BISHOP of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H. Con. Res. 122, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BISHOP of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Con. Res. 122, the PROTECT Patrimony Resolution, which expresses support for efforts to stop the theft, illegal sale, and trafficking of Native American tribal cultural items. I commend my colleague from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE) for introducing this important resolution.

The United States is home to 567 federally recognized tribes. Tribal cultural items and sacred artifacts of these tribes are central to Native American culture and religion. As we study and learn from these items, it is imperative that we also protect them from theft and commercialization for personal gain.

The extent and nature of this illegal activity is largely understudied. While the exact numbers have yet to be determined, the Bureau of Indian Affairs reports in its most recent statistics

that more than 8,000 objects of cultural patrimony have been repatriated since 1990. It remains unclear, however, how many items have been stolen or illegally sold. We must obtain more comprehensive data to better understand the nature of this issue.

For that reason, I joined Congressman PEARCE and Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations Subcommittee Chairman SENSENBRENNER in requesting a study by the Government Accountability Office to determine how the Federal Government can help prevent the illegal excavation and removal of cultural items from Federal and tribal land, the status of Federal agency efforts to repatriate Native American cultural items, and information about the international market for trafficking these cultural items.

Several auctions around the world have been criticized for routinely selling Native American goods. Earlier this year, the planned sale of an Acoma shield used in religious ceremonies was halted after the Federal Government and the Acoma Tribe advocated for its repatriation, claiming that there was reason to believe that this object was stolen.

H. Con. Res. 122 condemns the theft, illegal possession, or sale and export of tribal cultural items; supports the development of explicit restrictions on the export of tribal cultural items; calls upon the secretaries of various Federal agencies and the Attorney General to take affirmative steps to secure the repatriation of these items to their respective tribes, and encourages cooperation between governmental and tribal entities in these efforts.

□ 1930

Protection of tribal cultural items is critical to maintaining our Nation's cultural heritage. I look forward to obtaining more information through the GAO's research, and I urge passage of the resolution sponsored by my colleague, Congressman PEARCE.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Con. Res. 122, the Protection of the Right of Tribes to stop the Export of Cultural and Traditional Patrimony Resolution, or the PROTECT Patrimony Resolution. I commend Mr. PEARCE and his Democratic cosponsor, Ms. MCCOLLUM, for their leadership on this issue.

This important resolution condemns the theft, illegal possession, sale, transfer, and export for tribal cultural items belonging to American Indians, Alaska Natives, and American Hawaiians in the United States and internationally.

For those of us who have visited reservations, such as those in the State of Texas and Pueblos in New Mexico, we are well aware of the long, long history of Native Americans throughout the

United States. For far too long, Native Americans have struggled to protect their sacred and cultural artifacts—such as ancestral remains, funerary objects, and sacred items—from thieves who steal these precious objects, all in the pursuit of profits; and I hope it will now stop.

These irreplaceable objects are vital to the survival of tribal culture and to the maintenance of tribal ways of life. Yet, time and again, they are stolen by thieves who come in the dark of the night with axes, shovels, and even power tools to remove them from historical sites, which are often destroyed in the process.

In turn, these tribal cultural items are illegally sold domestically and internationally through black and public markets in violation of Federal and tribal laws that protect tribal cultural property rights. The loss of these artifacts harms not only Native Americans but all Americans. It robs our Nation of an incredibly important opportunity to learn from and respect these rich and vibrant cultures.

In recognition of these concerns, H. Con. Res. 122 calls upon various Federal agencies to consult with Native American tribes and their religious leaders in order to better understand the problem and, thereby, stop these illegal practices and repatriate stolen tribal cultural items to their rightful owners.

This resolution also asks the Government Accountability Office to study the scope of illegal trafficking in these artifacts, both domestically and internationally, which will help identify ways to end illegal trafficking.

Further, the resolution expresses support for the development of explicit restrictions on the export of tribal cultural items. Specifically, it encourages cooperation among State and local governments, as well as groups and organizations, in an effort to deter the theft, illegal possession, sale, and export of these items.

Accordingly, I support H. Con. Res. 122.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE), the sponsor of the resolution.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. BISHOP for yielding the time. I appreciate the comments from my colleague, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), on this significant bill and resolution that we are talking about tonight.

I grew up in the corner of New Mexico that does not have Indian tribes in it, so when I was elected to Congress in 2003, I began service, started traveling into some of the Indian reservations, and slowly began to develop relationships and friendships with those tribes.

In 2013, one of my friends from Laguna Pueblo called and said: we have one of our culturally significant items that is going on sale in Paris and in France.

And he said: we are going to try to buy it, but we are not sure that we can bring it home.

They ended up purchasing that item at the auction. And, sure enough, France would not allow them to take it out of the country, so we negotiated between our State Department and the French State Department. Finally, they were allowed to bring that item out.

They bought a first-class ticket for it. It was so significant that they did not want to let it travel as cargo in the hold of the airplane, instead, buying that first-class ticket to where it would sit there in the compartment with them.

Now, that is not a culture that I was familiar with until I began to form friendships among the Native Americans, but it is a story I hear repeated.

The same young man who purchased the item was going to buy the second item in that same sale and was dropped off the Internet down on the Indian reservation and did not purchase it. It is in his explanation of the missing of that second article. He said that he and his wife had lost a child in childbirth. And he said the feeling of missing that item was exactly the same as losing the child in childbirth.

Now, that is not something I necessarily can identify with, but I certainly identify with the emotions that say there are things that are so significant they should not be trafficked in.

We continued our kind of unofficial visits with the auction house at that point, and they began to say: look, many of the collectors would simply give the items back. They just don't want to be charged for things. These were sold usually in some sort of legal process. And so we had discussions, but nothing ever came of it.

Then again, at that same point, the Hopi Tribe in Arizona had articles for sale. One of them cost \$130,000. They had to buy them back. Again, the French Government would not help them at all. They took it to court and were simply turned down.

This year, Acoma came and said: look, we have got a couple of items that are in France, they are going on auction. We contacted the French Government, and they were simply resistant.

So we decided, with the help of the Acoma Tribe, with my friend, Mr. COLE, and Ms. MCCOLLUM, who has been a champion for Native American rights—we all formed the idea of this bill and submitted it. The day we submitted the bill, the French pulled the item. It was this time a shield from Acoma. They pulled it out of the auction.

Negotiations are still going on to bring that item back. But the idea that we as a government, we as the U.S. Government, should be studying these things that are around the world being sold internationally, maybe have enough significance that we would want them to be repatriated, we would

want them to come back to where people would know about their heritage.

Now, as I began to be familiar with the Indian culture, the U.S. Government was not always gracious in dealing with those Native American tribes. And so the least that we can do is help them reestablish that culture that lets them tell the children who are coming up about who they were, where they came from, and the things that are significant to them.

When I visit the tribes, occasionally they will bring out canes that were given to them to indicate their sovereignty. Those were given by Abraham Lincoln. Now, it sends goose bumps up and down my spine when I am standing on a tribal ground and they carefully bring out these canes that came from Abraham Lincoln to just signify their importance to the country. That is the value that their culture places on these items, and those items are passed around from one family to another to be in charge of the caretaking for it.

So this resolution today simply says that we want to study it, we want to figure out what we can do better, and let's do better.

Again, I thank my Democrat cosponsors. It is a very good bipartisan bill. It is a bicameral piece of legislation. I thank Chairman GOODLATTE and subcommittee Chairman SENSENBRENNER and the entire Judiciary Committee staff for the work on it.

I urge the passage of H. Con. Res. 122. Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Again, let me thank my good friend, Mr. PEARCE, and his cosponsors, Ms. MCCOLLUM and Mr. COLE, for their leadership.

In closing, tribal cultural objects play a crucial role in ensuring that Native Americans and generations to come retain the opportunity to learn about their rich heritage. They help to connect tribal members to their history, traditions, and personal identity. The story Mr. PEARCE told was a moving one and evidences how important this legislation is.

The theft of these objects is a direct assault against the vitality of Native American cultures. When they are stolen or destroyed, a piece of that culture is irretrievably gone not only for Native Americans but for all Americans and all others to understand that culture.

Our Nation has a responsibility to do everything in its power to protect and return these priceless artifacts. H. Con. Res. 122 recognizes the importance of this responsibility.

I, therefore, urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BISHOP) that the House suspend the

rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 122, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STRENGTHENING THE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY SECURE MAIL INITIATIVE ACT

Mr. BISHOP of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4712) to direct the Secretary of Homeland Security to provide for an option under the Secure Mail Initiative under which a person to whom a document is sent under that initiative may require that the United States Postal Service obtain a signature from that person in order to deliver the document, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4712

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 "Strengthening the Department of Homeland Security Secure Mail Initiative Act".

SEC. 2. OPTION FOR SIGNATURE REQUIREMENT UNDER THE SECURE MAIL INITIATIVE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Beginning not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall provide for an option under the Secure Mail Initiative (or any successor program) under which a person to whom a document is sent under that initiative may require that the United States Postal Service obtain a signature from that person in order to deliver the document.

(b) FEE.—The Secretary shall require the payment of a fee from a person requiring a signature under subsection (a). Such fee may be set at a level that will ensure recovery of the full costs of providing all such services. Such fee may also be set at a level that will recover any additional costs associated with the administration of the fees collected.

SEC. 3. REPORT.

Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit to Congress a report which includes—

(1) the implementation of the requirements under section 2;

(2) the fee imposed under section 2(b); and

(3) the number of times during the previous year that a person required a signature under section 2(a).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BISHOP) and the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BISHOP of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 4712, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BISHOP of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H.R. 4712, the Strengthening the Department of Homeland Security Secure Mail Initiative Act of 2016.

The bill is short, but it will have a great impact in the lives of many aliens seeking to play by the rules and legally live and work in the United States.

H.R. 4712 directs the Secretary of Homeland Security to allow immigration benefits recipients to elect to pay a fee and have their immigration documents sent to them via U.S. mail, signature required.

Currently, immigration documents are delivered via priority mail through the U.S. Postal Service. And while delivery can be monitored through use of a tracking number, there are numerous incidents of individuals not, in fact, receiving the documents that the U.S. Postal Service notes as delivered.

One obvious concern in such a case is that the document was intercepted by an unscrupulous individual who will fraudulently use it. Another concern is the cost and time it takes for the individual to reapply for the document, which, at this point, is the only recourse if a document has gone missing.

The U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services ombudsman discussed this problem in its FY16 report, noting that delays in receipt of immigration documents can adversely affect the ability of aliens to work or prove lawful immigration status.

H.R. 4712 imposes no cost to the United States taxpayer, since if an alien elects for their document to be delivered via signature required, the immigrant must first pay a fee set by USCIS that covers the cost of such delivery, as well as any administrative costs for the agency.

H.R. 4712 is a needed antifraud and good government measure.

I urge my colleagues to support it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am pleased to support H.R. 4712, a narrow and commonsense measure that requires U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services to provide an option for green cards and employment authorization documents to be delivered via U.S. mail with a signature confirmation.

I congratulate and thank the gentleman from California (Ms. SPEIER) for offering this important legislation.

□ 1945

Each year, the USCIS sends millions of secure documents to applicants through the U.S. Postal Service, including green cards, employment authorization documents, and travel documents. Currently, the delivery status

of these documents is monitored solely through tracking numbers. While we know when a document is delivered to the address on file, we have no way of knowing if the immigration applicant actually received the document; and if we don't know if the secure documents reach the intended recipient, we also don't know if they have fallen into the wrong—possibly criminal—hands. Although specific data is not available, conservative estimates indicate that, every year, thousands of documents—perhaps tens of thousands—are lost in the mail or, worse yet, are stolen.

According to USCIS policy, if the U.S. Postal Service does not return a document or a notice and if there has been no change of address, the USCIS will consider the document as having been properly delivered, and the applicant must refile and again pay the filing fee in order to obtain a replacement document. For green cards, the fee is \$450 even if the failure to receive the document was no fault of the individual's. This is not only unfair to the immigration applicant, but a lost or a stolen document also raises national security, identity theft, and other fraud concerns.

Today's bill makes just one simple but important change in that it requires the USCIS to allow immigration applicants to elect to pay a fee and have their documents mailed with an added level of security by requiring a signature from the person who accepts delivery. The cost will be borne by the applicant; so immigrants can be assured that the document won't be delivered without there being a signature from the recipient.

I urge the USCIS to consider other options to address these basic mailing issues, such as holding documents at USCIS facilities for direct pickup by the applicant. But, for today, I am pleased that we have agreement on this bill, which will help ameliorate document mailing and receipt problems and will strengthen the security and reliability of the immigration document delivery.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER), the author of the legislation.

Ms. SPEIER. I thank the gentlewoman from Texas for giving me the opportunity to speak about this bill.

Mr. Speaker, every once in a while, we get complaints, questions from constituents, and we actually can try and fix them. This is one of those situations.

For the longest time, I was getting complaints from residents in my district who had not received their immigration documentation. For the most part, I was not able to tell them that we could do anything, because we would call the Postal Service, and they would say there was really nothing we could do for them. I realized this was a serious problem.

There are some 50,000 green cards every year that go temporarily displaced or permanently displaced due to loss in delivery. That is about 5 percent of all green cards. With 50,000 green cards over 435 districts, you can see that we are talking about 10, 15, 20 complaints that we get every year. In my case, frankly, we stopped even logging them in because there was nothing that we could do about them. This idea came to be, and I thought why not try it. I am really very grateful that we are taking it up today.

My most recent constituent with this problem is from San Francisco. He has gone through the lawful process of getting his green card, only to have it lost. It has been over a year that he has been waiting for this document now. That means he can't travel, that he can't change jobs, that he can't get financial aid for college, that he can't open a retirement account, that he can't buy a house or anything else that most of us take for granted. This case shows that, when these documents are not properly delivered, the only solution is to reapply and pay another \$425. It is a small fix, but it carries a big wallop. That is why I am so grateful that we are taking it up.

The other issue is one of identity theft. You can also see how it could be used in a way that could create a national security risk. A stolen card could be used to travel or to purchase a firearm. We could easily fix this problem, as my colleagues have noted, by giving the applicant the option of paying an additional \$3 to require a signature at the time it is delivered.

I thank the committee, and especially my colleague Representative WOODALL from Georgia, for joining me in this effort. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. BISHOP of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL).

Mr. WOODALL. I thank the gentleman from Michigan for yielding me the time, and I appreciate the leadership of the gentlewoman from California.

Mr. Speaker, I stuck around tonight because we are doing two of my favorite things in this institution. We are taking ideas that came from constituents with problems who trusted us enough to bring us those problems. We are putting those things into action, and we are doing it not with a lot of shouting and not with a lot of pomp and circumstance. We are doing it just the way the process was supposed to work by which the gentlewoman from California crafts an idea, and she goes out and she solicits cosponsors, and the team on the Judiciary Committee works it through the process. Then it comes down here to the House floor, Mr. Speaker, where it is going to make real differences for real people.

Imagine you have done everything the right way—you have stood in line; you have played by the rules. You have done everything the way citizen and

American law has asked you to do it. Finally, your green card is ready to be delivered, and you are waiting at the post office for it to come—right there by the mailbox, waiting for it to come. You check online. Online, it says it was delivered yesterday, but you don't have it. You call your Congressman for help, and your Congressman says, "There is nothing we can do," and there hasn't been until this Speier legislation today.

For the first time, we give constituents who have played by the rules an opportunity to pay, at their expense, in order to guarantee that this document that will allow them to work, that will allow them to feed their families, that will allow them to pursue that American Dream is going to end up in their hands. Golly, it sounds small when you read the legislation, but if you are that family, Mr. Speaker, there is nothing bigger in your life.

I am grateful for the partnership of all of my colleagues who made this possible tonight.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

In closing, let me again congratulate Congresswoman SPEIER and Congressman WOODALL. I am equally grateful when we have the opportunity to work together. I see this as an opportunity on many, many issues.

For example, this legislation, albeit simple in context, has a broad influence and impact. It means that anyone who is intending to do harm by either having stolen mail or by having taken a document that does not belong to them now can be thwarted. In this climate in which we must be particularly sensitive in protecting the Nation against terrorism, domestic terrorism, people misusing documents, or identity theft, this is a very important contribution to thwarting that effort. As has been indicated, it gives individuals who work very hard and who desire the American Dream the opportunity to be documented.

I think it fits very well in what I hope will be an ongoing commitment to improving the immigration system to the extent of passing comprehensive immigration reform, because it does recognize that there are people who are desiring to do good who come to this country.

For that reason, I ask my colleagues to support this important contribution to those who work hard, who choose to support the values of this Nation, and who work hard as new immigrants and as potential citizens of this Nation. I ask my colleagues to support H.R. 4712.

I also thank the Judiciary Committee for its work on this legislation.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BISHOP) that the House suspend the

rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4712, 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.

IMPROVING SMALL BUSINESS CYBER SECURITY ACT OF 2016

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5064) to amend the Small Business Act to allow small business development centers to assist and advise small business concerns on relevant cyber security matters, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5064

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 "Improving Small Business Cyber Security Act of 2016".

SEC. 2. ROLE OF SMALL BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT CENTERS IN CYBER SECURITY AND PREPAREDNESS.

Section 21 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 648) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1), by striking "and providing access to business analysts who can refer small business concerns to available experts;" and inserting "providing access to business analysts who can refer small business concerns to available experts; and, to the extent practicable, providing assistance in furtherance of the Small Business Development Center Cyber Strategy developed under section 5(b) of the Improving Small Business Cyber Security Act of 2016"; and

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (E), by striking "and" at the end;

(ii) in subparagraph (F), by striking the period and inserting "; and"; and

(iii) by adding at the end of the following:

"(G) access to cyber security specialists to counsel, assist, and inform small business concern clients, in furtherance of the Small Business Development Center Cyber Strategy developed under section 5(b) of the Improving Small Business Cyber Security Act of 2016."

SEC. 3. ADDITIONAL CYBER SECURITY ASSISTANCE FOR SMALL BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT CENTERS.

Section 21(a) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 648(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(8) CYBER SECURITY ASSISTANCE.—The Department of Homeland Security, and any other Federal department or agency in coordination with the Department of Homeland Security, may leverage small business development centers to provide assistance to small businesses by disseminating cyber security risk information and other homeland security information to help small business concerns in developing or enhancing cyber security infrastructure, cyber threat awareness, and cyber training programs for employees."

SEC. 4. CYBER SECURITY OUTREACH FOR SMALL BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT CENTERS.

Section 227 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 148) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (l) as subsection (m); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (k) the following:

"(1) CYBERSECURITY OUTREACH.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may leverage small business development centers to provide assistance to small business concerns by disseminating information on cyber threat indicators, defensive measures, cybersecurity risks, incidents, analyses, and warnings to help small business concerns in developing or enhancing cybersecurity infrastructure, cyber threat awareness, and cyber training programs for employees.

"(2) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this subsection, the terms 'small business concern' and 'small business development center' have the meaning given such terms, respectively, under section 3 of the Small Business Act."

SEC. 5. GAO STUDY ON SMALL BUSINESS CYBER SUPPORT SERVICES AND SMALL BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT CENTER CYBER STRATEGY.

(a) REVIEW OF CURRENT CYBER SECURITY RESOURCES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a review of current cyber security resources at the Federal level aimed at assisting small business concerns with developing or enhancing cyber security infrastructure, cyber threat awareness, or cyber training programs for employees.

(2) CONTENT.—The review required under paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) An accounting and description of all Federal Government programs, projects, and activities that currently provide assistance to small business concerns in developing or enhancing cyber security infrastructure, cyber threat awareness, or cyber training programs for employees.

(B) An assessment of how widely utilized the resources described under subparagraph (A) are by small business concerns and a review of whether or not such resources are duplicative of other programs and structured in a manner that makes them accessible to and supportive of small business concerns.

(3) REPORT.—The Comptroller General shall issue a report to the Congress, the Administrator of the Small Business Administration, the Secretary of Homeland Security, and any association recognized under section 21(a)(3)(A) of the Small Business Act containing all findings and determinations made in carrying out the review required under paragraph (1).

(b) SMALL BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT CENTER CYBER STRATEGY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the issuance of the report under subsection (a)(3), the Administrator of the Small Business Administration and the Secretary of Homeland Security shall work collaboratively to develop a Small Business Development Center Cyber Strategy.

(2) CONSULTATION.—In developing the strategy under this subsection, the Administrator of the Small Business Administration and the Secretary of Homeland Security shall consult with entities representing the concerns of small business development centers, including any association recognized under section 21(a)(3)(A) of the Small Business Act.

(3) CONTENT.—The strategy required under paragraph (1) shall include, at minimum, the following:

(A) Plans for leveraging small business development centers (SBDCs) to access existing cyber programs of the Department of Homeland Security and other appropriate Federal agencies to enhance services and streamline cyber assistance to small business concerns.

(B) To the extent practicable, methods for the provision of counsel and assistance to

improve a small business concern's cyber security infrastructure, cyber threat awareness, and cyber training programs for employees, including—

(i) working to ensure individuals are aware of best practices in the areas of cyber security, cyber threat awareness, and cyber training;

(ii) working with individuals to develop cost-effective plans for implementing best practices in these areas;

(iii) entering into agreements, where practical, with Information Sharing and Analysis Centers or similar cyber information sharing entities to gain an awareness of actionable threat information that may be beneficial to small business concerns; and

(iv) providing referrals to area specialists when necessary.

(c) An analysis of—

(I) how Federal Government programs, projects, and activities identified by the Comptroller General in the report issued under subsection (a)(1) can be leveraged by SBDCs to improve access to high-quality cyber support for small business concerns;

(ii) additional resources SBDCs may need to effectively carry out their role; and

(iii) how SBDCs can leverage existing partnerships and develop new ones with Federal, State, and local government entities as well as private entities to improve the quality of cyber support services to small business concerns.

(4) DELIVERY OF STRATEGY.—Not later than 180 days after the issuance of the report under subsection (a)(3), the Small Business Development Center Cyber Strategy shall be issued to the Committees on Homeland Security and Small Business of the House of Representatives and the Committees on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs and Small Business and Entrepreneurship of the Senate.

(c) DEFINITION.—The term “small business development center” has the meaning given such term in section 3 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632).

SEC. 6. PROHIBITION ON ADDITIONAL FUNDS.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) and the gentleman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

It is an honor to serve as chairman of the House Small Business Committee. It affords me the special opportunity of hearing directly from the very men and women who help drive our economy—America's small-business owners.

At a hearing several months ago, a small business owner shared his per-

sonal experience with a serious cyber attack. He said:

I logged into our bank accounts, and to my utter horror, I found that my balance was zero. This was a payday, and I was terrified that the paychecks that were issued that day would not clear. We were supporting a number of families, many of which live paycheck to paycheck and could not have made it without the paycheck we issued that day. I was also very worried about our business' reputation since a restaurant nearby had just bounced their paychecks, and the company never recovered from the bad publicity they received from not making their payroll.

Stories like this show the real-world consequences of cyber attacks. Small businesses are at serious risk from a growing number of cyber threats.

There is no doubt that the information technology revolution has provided small businesses with new tools and opportunities to compete in the global economy. However, technology changes mean hackers are coming up with more and more sophisticated methods to go after intellectual property, bank accounts, Social Security numbers, and anything else that can be used for financial gain or for a competitive edge.

In 2015, the average amount stolen from small business bank accounts after a cyber attack was over \$32,000; and according to a recent report by Verizon Enterprise Solutions, a shocking 71 percent of cyber attacks occurred in businesses with fewer than 100 employees.

It is absolutely critical to both the economic and national security of this country that our small businesses have all of the necessary cyber tools to protect themselves from cyber attacks. Small businesses lack the resources to combat cyber attacks. The Federal Government needs to step up its game when it comes to protecting the cybersecurity of small businesses and individuals. That is why I support H.R. 5064, the Improving Small Business Cyber Security Act of 2016.

This legislation will help small businesses that face cyber threats by providing access to additional tools, resources, and expertise through existing Federal cyber resources by allowing the Department of Homeland Security and other Federal agencies to provide assistance to small businesses through the Small Business Administration's non-Federal partners, the Small Business Development Centers, or SBDCs. This increased coordination will lead to greater cyber support for small businesses.

I commend Mr. HANNA for his hard work on this legislation. He has done a great job as chairman of his subcommittee. Unfortunately, he announced his retirement, and he will be leaving us after this term. He has really done a tremendous amount of work for small businesses all over the country because he, himself, has been a successful small-business person; so he knows what the challenges are, and he has tried to put them to work in his years here in the House in helping

small businesses all across the country. After all, 70 percent of the new jobs that are created in the American economy are created by small businesses, so they are absolutely critical. Again, I commend Mr. HANNA for his hard work on behalf of these folks.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 5064.

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

□ 2000

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

I rise in support of H.R. 5064, the Improving Small Business Cyber Security Act of 2016. Technology has changed the way we all live, but none more so than for small businesses. It has afforded America's small employers a unique opportunity to sell their products not just nationally, but globally.

Despite new occasions for economic growth, technology has also introduced profound risks. We hear too often of data breaches and cyber espionage. Yet, we never really think this could happen to us until it does. All it takes is one incident to have devastating impacts to small businesses. In fact, 60 percent of small entities go out of business after 6 months of being hacked.

Clearly, cybersecurity should be a priority to protect our national security and economy. Failure to do so leaves us all at risk. Whether a business is adopting cloud computing or simply maintaining a Web site, cybersecurity should be part of their plan. However, only 31 percent of small firms take active measures to guard against such attacks, making them the ideal target for cybercriminals.

A lack of awareness and the high cost to install security mechanisms leaves many small-business owners exposed. Those that are aware of the threat, like government contractors, must navigate demanding IT specifications and complex regulations in order to stay competitive and win Federal contracts.

To help facilitate the preventive measures within the private sector, H.R. 5064, the Improving Small Business Cyber Security Act, will leverage the Small Business Administration's vast network of Small Business Development Centers.

With 63 lead centers and 900 outreach locations, SBDCs have the capacity to reach small businesses throughout the country. They also have a proven record of assisting entrepreneurs with extensive courses in management and technical assistance. In the last fiscal year, SBDCs trained over 260,000 clients and advised almost 190,000 clients.

This bill will utilize these existing resource partners by allowing the centers to assist small firms in developing and enhancing their cybersecurity infrastructure and employee training programs. The bill also calls for an SBDC cyber strategy to be designed to further support small employers to

protect themselves, their employees, and their customers.

This legislation ensures that our national efforts combating cyber attacks can be utilized by our Nation's more vulnerable businesses. We cannot continue to accept the bare minimum as our Nation seeks to end continued data breaches. Therefore, I ask my fellow Members to support this bill.

Let me just take this opportunity, also, to commend the gentleman from New York (Mr. HANNA) for the great work that he has done on this issue.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. HANNA).

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman CHABOT, Chairman MCCAUL, Ranking Member VELÁZQUEZ, and Ranking Member THOMPSON for the support of their committees on this bill. This bill was a collaborative endeavor and all of their staffs worked hard and long to help ensure this bill made it to the floor today.

I also want to thank the bill's lead sponsor, Representative KILMER, for working with us on this bipartisan legislation.

America's small businesses are a critical part of our Nation's economy. There are 28 million small businesses, and in recent years they have increasingly become the victims of cyber attacks. By one estimate, nearly 70 percent of all cyber attacks are now being directed at our Nation's small businesses.

The reason for this is clear. Small businesses too often lack the resources or the experience required to make prudent investments in cybersecurity.

The Improving Small Business Cyber Security Act addresses this issue by empowering the more than 900 Small Business Development Centers across our country to provide cyber support to these small businesses. This support would be offered in accordance with a small business cybersecurity strategy, which would be developed jointly by the Department of Homeland Security and the Small Business Administration.

Cyber attacks can decimate small businesses, potentially costing them tens of thousands of dollars to recover lost data and secure networks. It is clear to all of us that the upfront cost to invest in state-of-the-art technologies are prohibitive for many businesses.

This bill represents an opportunity to help small businesses bridge the knowledge gap in cyberspace by empowering the Small Business Development Centers to provide up-to-date relevant and cost-effective cyber support to service them.

This bill also makes good financial sense. By relying on already existing programs and infrastructure, it improves the Federal resources we already have to ensure that they better work for America's small businesses and at no additional cost.

I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense bill. Again, I would like to thank Chairman CHABOT for his support.

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

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. KNIGHT), a member of the Small Business Committee.

Mr. KNIGHT. Mr. Speaker, we talk a lot about cybersecurity in the context of national defense, and rightfully so. As a Nation, we ought to take steps now to ensure our security into the 21st century. But this is an issue that affects so many people. One that often gets overlooked is the small business community.

As small businesses increasingly rely on Web-based products and services, they offer themselves more and more attacks from cybercriminals. Increases in technology have resulted in more sophisticated methods of cyber attacks, including hacking, malicious software, physical error, and lost or stolen devices.

Even a simple cyber attack can effectively destroy a small business. In fact, 81 percent of small businesses are concerned about a cyber attack, but only 63 percent have a cybersecurity measure in place.

Many businesses do not feel that they have the adequate legal protections to share cyber threat indicators with the National Cybersecurity and Communications Integration Center, the NCCIC. It is clear to me that the public and private sector must work together to protect our small businesses.

The Improving Small Business Cyber Security Act of 2016 eases the burden on small businesses facing cyber threats by providing access to additional tools, resources, and expertise through existing Federal cyber resources.

I am proud to cosponsor this legislation, and it will lead to increased security for our small businesses, which will lead to greater growth and opportunities for them.

I urge this Chamber to support this important measure.

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

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RATCLIFFE), who is the chairman of Homeland Security's Subcommittee on Cybersecurity, Infrastructure Protection, and Security Technologies, which handles cybersecurity and a number of other very important issues.

Mr. RATCLIFFE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 5064, the Improving Small Business Cyber Security Act of 2016. I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. HANNA) for leading the charge on this very important piece of legislation. I also thank Chairman CHABOT for his leadership on the Small Business Committee and Chairman MCCAUL for his leadership on the Committee on Homeland Security.

Mr. Speaker, American small businesses are on the frontlines in the battle against cybercriminals, but right now many of them lack the resources to combat this growing and sophisticated threat. America's 28 million small businesses constitute 54 percent of our annual sales here in the United States and, because of that, they are under cyber attack like never before. The frequency and high costs of such attacks on small businesses is causing ripple effects throughout our economy right now.

H.R. 5064 amends the Homeland Security Act to ensure that Small Business Development Centers can leverage existing cybersecurity programs at the Department of Homeland Security. Additionally, this bill requires the Department of Homeland Security and the Small Business Administration to jointly develop a cyber strategy for small businesses so that they can better utilize cyber programs from DHS and from the Federal Government.

H.R. 5064 also requires a review by the Government Accountability Office of current cybersecurity programs offered by the Federal Government to small businesses.

Mr. Speaker, Small Business Development Centers have been on the ground helping small businesses in this country for more than 30 years. They have a presence in virtually every community in this country. This bill provides them with tools, resources, and the expert guidance that they need to tap into the already existing cyber resources in order to better meet the 21st century needs of small businesses in this country.

Small businesses, Mr. Speaker, are the life blood of the American economy, so we need to ensure that resources are available to all of them to combat these cyber threats. This bill works to achieve that goal.

I, therefore, ask my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 5064.

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

Our committee hears from small businesses too often about the cost and complexities associated with cybersecurity. With businesses having to be familiar with small business data regulations, ever-changing cyber threats, and the cost to install and maintain a cybersecurity system, many small-business owners wonder when they will have time to actually operate their business.

The changes made by H.R. 5064 will unify our efforts and create a streamlined process for small employers seeking to install cyber safeguards. Utilizing the existing national network of SBDCs—many of which small businesses already seek assistance from—as a source for cyber education and awareness provides a critical tool for American entrepreneurs.

I, once again, urge my colleagues to support this measure.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to close.

Mr. Speaker, I would, first of all, like to thank my colleague, Ranking Member VELÁZQUEZ, for, once again, working in a bipartisan and cooperative effort. That is one thing on the Small Business Committee we always try to do, and we have a very good working relationship. I want to thank the gentlewoman for continuing that on this bill and bills in the past and, hopefully, bills in the future as well.

Relative to cybersecurity attacks, we have seen the United States under a legion of attacks in recent years. They happen virtually every day. The Federal Government itself has been hit a number of times. The Office of Personnel Management had 20-plus-million personal individuals who had their files hacked in the government. We have seen the Postal Service, we have seen the State Department, and we have even seen the White House hacked. So it is a big problem.

Now, this happens to large corporations. We have had some of the largest corporations who have really taken it on the chin, and literally it cost them millions of dollars. Corporations like Target and you name it, they have really been hit. They generally have the resources that they can recover from this. As detrimental as it is to their business, they survive.

When this happens to small businesses, it may virtually be the death knell for them. You may have families who no longer have their source of support because the business just can't take a hit like this.

In my opening statement, I mentioned the person who knew the restaurant down the street that it happened to them. The businessowner wanted to pay his employees, and he couldn't pay them because his balance was zero. So this is a serious threat.

The small business community needs help. This is a step in the right direction. Representative HANNA, whom we have all praised, really does deserve the praise because he took this and worked very hard to get this bill to the point where we are here tonight. Hopefully we are going to pass the bill.

So I think this is a great piece of legislation. H.R. 5064 would offer much-needed cybersecurity support to America's small businesses. It would also better coordinate the Federal Government's overall strategy in helping small businesses to thwart cyber attacks.

I would urge my colleagues to support this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 2015

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POLIQUIN). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5064, 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.

NICARAGUAN INVESTMENT CONDITIONALITY ACT (NICA) OF 2016

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Financial Services be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 5708) to oppose loans at international financial institutions for the Government of Nicaragua unless the Government of Nicaragua is taking effective steps to hold free, fair, and transparent elections, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5708

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 "Nicaraguan Investment Conditionality Act (NICA) of 2016".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) In 2006, Nicaragua, under President Enrique Bolaños, entered into a \$175,000,000, 5-year compact with the Millennium Challenge Corporation (MCC).

(2) After the 2008 municipal elections, the MCC stated that there was a pattern of decline in political rights and civil liberties in Nicaragua.

(3) In 2009, the MCC terminated the compact and reduced the amount of MCC funds available to Nicaragua by \$61,500,000, which led to the compact ending in 2011.

(4) According to Nicaraguan law, the National Assembly is the only institution allowed to change the constitution but in 2009, Daniel Ortega circumvented the legislature and went to the Supreme Court, which he controls, to rule in his favor that Presidential term limits were inapplicable.

(5) The House Committee on Foreign Affairs convened a congressional hearing on December 1, 2011, entitled "Democracy Held Hostage in Nicaragua: Part 1" where former United States Ambassador to Nicaragua Robert Callahan testified, "First, that Daniel Ortega's candidacy was illegal, illegitimate, and unconstitutional; second, that the period leading to the elections and the elections themselves were marred by serious fraud; third, that Daniel Ortega and his Sandinista party have systematically undermined the country's fragile governmental institutions".

(6) From fiscal year 2012 until present, the Department of State found that Nicaragua did not meet international standards of fiscal transparency.

(7) On January 25, 2012, a press statement from Secretary of State Hillary Clinton said: "As noted by international observers and Nicaraguan civil society groups, Nicaragua's recent elections were not conducted in a transparent and impartial manner, and the entire electoral process was marred by significant irregularities. The elections marked a setback to democracy in Nicaragua and un-

dermined the ability of Nicaraguans to hold their government accountable."

(8) According to the Department of State's 2015 Fiscal Transparency Report: "The government does not publicly account for the expenditure of significant off-budget assistance from Venezuela and this assistance is not subject to audit or legislative oversight. Allocations to and earnings from state-owned enterprises are included in the budget, but most state-owned enterprises are not audited. The supreme audit institution also does not audit the government's full financial statements. Nicaragua's fiscal transparency would be improved by including all off-budget revenue and expenditure in the budget, auditing state-owned enterprises, and conducting a full audit of the government's annual financial statements and making audit reports publicly available within a reasonable period of time."

(9) According to the Department of State's Country Reports on Human Rights Practices for 2015: "In 2011 the Supreme Electoral Council (CSE) announced the re-election of President Daniel Ortega Saavedra of the Sandinista National Liberation Front (FSLN) in elections that international and domestic observers characterized as seriously flawed. International and domestic organizations raised concerns regarding the constitutional legitimacy of Ortega's re-election. The 2011 elections also provided the ruling party with a supermajority in the National Assembly, allowing for changes in the constitution, including extending the reach of executive branch power and the elimination of restrictions on re-election for executive branch officials and mayors. Observers noted serious flaws during the 2012 municipal elections and March 2014 regional elections."

(10) According to the Department of State's Country Reports on Human Rights Practices for 2015 in Nicaragua: "The principal human rights abuses were restrictions on citizens' right to vote; obstacles to freedom of speech and press, including government intimidation and harassment of journalists and independent media, as well as increased restriction of access to public information, including national statistics from public offices; and increased government harassment and intimidation of nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) and civil society organizations."

(11) The same 2015 report stated: "Additional significant human rights abuses included considerably biased policies to promote single-party dominance; arbitrary police arrest and detention of suspects, including abuse during detention; harsh and life-threatening prison conditions with arbitrary and lengthy pretrial detention; discrimination against ethnic minorities and indigenous persons and communities."

(12) In February 2016, the Ortega regime detained and expelled Freedom House's Latin America Director, Dr. Carlos Ponce, from Nicaragua.

(13) On May 10, 2016, the Supreme Electoral Council announced and published the electoral calendar which aims to govern the electoral process.

(14) After receiving the electoral calendar for the 2016 Presidential elections, the Nicaraguan political opposition raised concerns and pointed to a number of anomalies such as: the electoral calendar failed to contemplate national and international observations, failed to agree to publicly publish the precincts results of each Junta Receptora de Voto (JRV), and failed to purge the electoral registration rolls in a transparent and open manner.

(15) Nicaragua's constitution mandates terms of 5 years for municipal authorities,

which would indicate that the next municipal elections must occur in 2017.

(16) On June 3, 2016, the Nicaraguan Supreme Court—which is controlled by Ortega—instructed the Supreme Electoral Council not to swear in Nicaraguan opposition members to the departmental and regional electoral councils.

(17) On June 5, 2016, regarding international observers for the 2016 Presidential elections, Daniel Ortega stated: “Here, the observation ends. Go observe other countries . . . There will be no observation, neither from the European Union, nor the OAS . . .”.

(18) On June 7, 2016, the Department of State’s Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights and Labor posted on social media: “Disappointed government of Nicaragua said it will deny electoral observers requested by Nicaraguan citizens, church, and private sector . . . We continue to encourage the government of Nicaragua to allow electoral observers as requested by Nicaraguans.”.

(19) On June 8, 2016, the Supreme Electoral Council—which is controlled by Ortega—announced a ruling, which changed the leadership structure of the opposition party and in practice allegedly barred all existing opposition candidates from running for office.

(20) On June 14, 2016, Daniel Ortega expelled three United States Government officials (two officials from U.S. Customs and Border Protection and one professor from the National Defense University) from Nicaragua.

(21) On June 22, 2016, a Global Fellow from the Woodrow Wilson Center chose to leave Nicaragua because of fear. According to a media report, the fellow stated “Police were following me. I did not understand the reason why they were following me, but it was clear to me what they were doing . . . Of course (I felt fear), I was surprised especially because the research I am doing is completely academic, not journalistic, and that made me wonder why they would be so interested in something like that.”.

(22) On June 29, 2016, the Department of State issued a Nicaragua Travel Alert which stated: “The Department of State alerts U.S. citizens about increased government scrutiny of foreigners’ activities, new requirements for volunteer groups, and the potential for demonstrations during the upcoming election season in Nicaragua . . . Nicaraguan authorities have denied entry to, detained, questioned, or expelled foreigners, including U.S. government officials, academics, NGO workers, and journalists, for discussions, written reports or articles, photographs, and/or videos related to these topics. Authorities may monitor and question private U.S. citizens concerning their activities, including contact with Nicaraguan citizens.”.

(23) On June 30, 2016, the Human Rights Foundation issued a press release stating: “. . . Daniel Ortega has used all sorts of trickery to push for constitutional reforms and illegal court rulings in order to extend his time in power indefinitely . . . If the opposition is not allowed to meaningfully compete, the upcoming elections in Nicaragua cannot be considered free and fair and the Inter-American Democratic Charter should be applied to the Sandinista regime.”. The release continued, stating that “The principle of alternation of power is enshrined in the Inter-American Democratic Charter (IADC) as an essential element of democracy. Even though Ortega pushed through a constitutional amendment allowing for indefinite re-election, he did so by circumventing the separation of powers illegally. An uncontested re-election of Ortega would clearly violate the IADC, which was signed by Nicaragua in 2001. If that is the case, Secretary General Almagro should activate the

IADC and, if necessary, call for the suspension of Nicaragua from the OAS.”.

SEC. 3. STATEMENT OF POLICY.

It is the policy of the United States to support—

(1) the rule of law and an independent judiciary and electoral council in Nicaragua;

(2) independent pro-democracy organizations in Nicaragua; and

(3) free, fair, and transparent elections under international and domestic observers in Nicaragua in 2016 and 2017.

SEC. 4. INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The President shall instruct the United States Executive Director at each international financial institution to use the voice, vote, and influence of the United States to oppose any loan or other utilization of the funds of the respective institution for the benefit of the Government of Nicaragua, other than to address basic human needs or to promote democracy, unless the Secretary of State certifies and reports to the appropriate congressional committees that the Government of Nicaragua is taking effective steps to—

(1) hold free, fair, and transparent elections overseen by credible domestic and international electoral observers;

(2) promote democracy, as well as an independent judiciary system and electoral council;

(3) strengthen the rule of law; and

(4) respect the right to freedom of association and expression.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(A) the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Appropriations, and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives;

(B) the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Appropriations, and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate.

(2) INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTION.—The term “international financial institution” means the International Monetary Fund, International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, International Development Association, International Finance Corporation, Multilateral Investment Guarantee Agency, African Development Bank, African Development Fund, Asian Development Bank, Inter-American Development Bank, Bank for Economic Cooperation and Development in the Middle East and North Africa, and Inter-American Investment Corporation.

(c) TERMINATION.—This section shall terminate on the day after the date on which the Secretary of State certifies and reports to the appropriate congressional committees that the requirements of subsection (a) are met.

SEC. 5. ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that, according to the Organization of American States (OAS) report on the Nicaraguan 2011 Presidential elections, Nicaragua: Final Report, General Elections, OAS (2011), the OAS made the following recommendations to the Government of Nicaragua:

(1) “Prepare alternative procedures for updating the electoral roll when a registered voter dies.”.

(2) “Publish the electoral roll so that new additions, changes of address and exclusions can be checked.”.

(3) “Reform the mechanism for accreditation of poll watchers using a formula that ensures that the political parties will have greater autonomy to accredit their respective poll watchers.”.

(4) “Institute regulations to ensure that party poll watchers are involved in all areas of the electoral structure, including the departmental, regional and municipal electoral councils and polling stations. Rules should be crafted to spell out their authorities and functions and the means by which they can exercise their authority and perform their functions.”.

(5) “Redesign the CSE administrative structure at the central and field levels, while standardizing technical and operational procedures, including the design of control mechanisms from the time registration to the delivery of the document to the citizens; the process of issuing identity cards should be timed to the calendar and, to avoid congestion within the process, be evenly spaced.”.

(b) ELECTORAL OBSERVATION MISSION.—The President shall direct the United States Permanent Representative to the Organization of American States (OAS) to use the voice, vote, and influence of the United States at the OAS to strongly advocate for an Electoral Observation Mission to be sent to Nicaragua in 2016 and 2017.

SEC. 6. STATEMENT OF POLICY.

The Department of State and the United States Agency for International Development should prioritize foreign assistance to the people of Nicaragua to assist civil society in democracy and governance programs, including human rights documentation.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROYCE

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment to the bill at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Nicaraguan Investment Conditionality Act (NICA) of 2016”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) In 2006, Nicaragua, under President Enrique Bolaños, entered into a \$175,000,000, 5-year compact with the Millennium Challenge Corporation (MCC).

(2) After the 2008 municipal elections, the MCC stated that there was a pattern of decline in political rights and civil liberties in Nicaragua.

(3) In 2009, the MCC terminated the compact and reduced the amount of MCC funds available to Nicaragua by \$61,500,000, which led to the compact ending in 2011.

(4) According to Nicaraguan law, the National Assembly is the only institution allowed to change the constitution but in 2009, Daniel Ortega circumvented the legislature and went to the Supreme Court, which he controls, to rule in his favor that Presidential term limits were inapplicable.

(5) The House Committee on Foreign Affairs convened a congressional hearing on December 1, 2011, entitled “Democracy Held Hostage in Nicaragua: Part 1” where former United States Ambassador to Nicaragua Robert Callahan testified, “First, that Daniel Ortega’s candidacy was illegal, illegitimate, and unconstitutional; second, that the period leading to the elections and the elections themselves were marred by serious fraud; third, that Daniel Ortega and his Sandinista party have systematically undermined the country’s fragile governmental institutions”.

(6) From fiscal year 2012 until present, the Department of State found that Nicaragua did not meet international standards of fiscal transparency.

(7) On January 25, 2012, a press statement from Secretary of State Hillary Clinton said:

“As noted by international observers and Nicaraguan civil society groups, Nicaragua’s recent elections were not conducted in a transparent and impartial manner, and the entire electoral process was marred by significant irregularities. The elections marked a setback to democracy in Nicaragua and undermined the ability of Nicaraguans to hold their government accountable.”

(8) According to the Department of State’s 2015 Fiscal Transparency Report: “Nicaragua’s fiscal transparency would be improved by including all off-budget revenue and expenditure in the budget, auditing state-owned enterprises, and conducting a full audit of the government’s annual financial statements and making audit reports publicly available within a reasonable period of time.”

(9) According to the Department of State’s Country Reports on Human Rights Practices for 2015: “In 2011 the Supreme Electoral Council (CSE) announced the re-election of President Daniel Ortega Saavedra of the Sandinista National Liberation Front (FSLN) in elections that international and domestic observers characterized as seriously flawed. International and domestic organizations raised concerns regarding the constitutional legitimacy of Ortega’s re-election. The 2011 elections also provided the ruling party with a supermajority in the National Assembly, allowing for changes in the constitution, including extending the reach of executive branch power and the elimination of restrictions on re-election for executive branch officials and mayors. Observers noted serious flaws during the 2012 municipal elections and March 2014 regional elections.”

(10) According to the Department of State’s Country Reports on Human Rights Practices for 2015 in Nicaragua: “The principal human rights abuses were restrictions on citizens’ right to vote; obstacles to freedom of speech and press, including government intimidation and harassment of journalists and independent media, as well as increased restriction of access to public information, including national statistics from public offices; and increased government harassment and intimidation of nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) and civil society organizations.

(11) The same 2015 report stated: “Additional significant human rights abuses included considerably biased policies to promote single-party dominance; arbitrary police arrest and detention of suspects, including abuse during detention; harsh and life-threatening prison conditions with arbitrary and lengthy pretrial detention; discrimination against ethnic minorities and indigenous persons and communities.”

(12) In February 2016, the Ortega regime detained and expelled Freedom House’s Latin America Director, Dr. Carlos Ponce, from Nicaragua.

(13) On May 10, 2016, the Supreme Electoral Council announced and published the electoral calendar which aims to govern the electoral process.

(14) After receiving the electoral calendar for the 2016 Presidential elections, the Nicaraguan political opposition raised concerns and pointed to a number of anomalies such as: the electoral calendar failed to contemplate national and international observations, failed to agree to publicly publish the precincts results of each Junta Receptora de Voto (JRV), and failed to purge the electoral registration rolls in a transparent and open manner.

(15) Nicaragua’s constitution mandates terms of 5 years for municipal authorities, which would indicate that the next municipal elections must occur in 2017.

(16) On June 3, 2016, the Nicaraguan Supreme Court—which is controlled by Nicaragua’s leader, Daniel Ortega—instructed the Supreme Electoral Council not to swear in Nicaraguan opposition members to the departmental and regional electoral councils.

(17) On June 5, 2016, regarding international observers for the 2016 Presidential elections, President Ortega stated: “Here, the observation ends. Go observe other countries . . . There will be no observation, neither from the European Union, nor the OAS . . .”

(18) On June 7, 2016, the Department of State’s Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights and Labor posted on social media: “Disappointed government of Nicaragua said it will deny electoral observers requested by Nicaraguan citizens, church, and private sector . . . We continue to encourage the government of Nicaragua to allow electoral observers as requested by Nicaraguans.”

(19) On June 8, 2016, the Supreme Electoral Council—which is controlled by Nicaragua’s leader, Daniel Ortega—announced a ruling, which changed the leadership structure of the opposition party and in practice allegedly barred all existing opposition candidates from running for office.

(20) On June 14, 2016, President Ortega expelled three United States Government officials (two officials from U.S. Customs and Border Protection and one professor from the National Defense University) from Nicaragua.

(21) On June 29, 2016, the Department of State issued a Nicaragua Travel Alert which stated: “The Department of State alerts U.S. citizens about increased government scrutiny of foreigners’ activities, new requirements for volunteer groups, and the potential for demonstrations during the upcoming election season in Nicaragua . . . Nicaraguan authorities have denied entry to, detained, questioned, or expelled foreigners, including United States Government officials, academics, NGO workers, and journalists, for discussions, written reports or articles, photographs, and/or videos related to these topics. Authorities may monitor and question private United States citizens concerning their activities, including contact with Nicaraguan citizens.”

(22) On August 1, 2016, the Department of State issued a press release to express grave concern over the Nicaraguan government limiting democratic space leading up to the elections in November and stated that “[o]n June 8, the Nicaraguan Supreme Court stripped the opposition Independent Liberal Party (PLI) from its long recognized leader. The Supreme Court took similar action on June 17 when it invalidated the leadership of the Citizen Action Party, the only remaining opposition party with the legal standing to present a presidential candidate. Most recently, on July 29, the Supreme Electoral Council removed 28 PLI national assembly members (16 seated and 12 alternates) from their popularly-elected positions.”

SEC. 3. STATEMENT OF POLICY.

It is the policy of the United States to support—

- (1) the rule of law and an independent judiciary and electoral council in Nicaragua;
- (2) independent pro-democracy organizations in Nicaragua; and
- (3) free, fair, and transparent elections under international and domestic observers in Nicaragua in 2016 and 2017.

SEC. 4. INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The President shall instruct the United States Executive Director at each international financial institution to use the voice, vote, and influence of the

United States to oppose any loan for the benefit of the Government of Nicaragua, other than to address basic human needs or promote democracy, unless the Secretary of State certifies and reports to the appropriate congressional committees that the Government of Nicaragua is taking effective steps to—

- (1) hold free, fair, and transparent elections overseen by credible domestic and international electoral observers;
- (2) promote democracy, as well as an independent judicial system and electoral council;
- (3) strengthen the rule of law; and
- (4) respect the right to freedom of association and expression.

(b) REPORT.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a written report assessing—

- (1) the effectiveness of the international financial institutions in enforcing applicable program safeguards in Nicaragua; and
- (2) the effects of the matters described in section 2 on long-term prospects for positive development outcomes in Nicaragua.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(A) the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Appropriations, and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives; and

(B) the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Appropriations, and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate.

(2) INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTION.—The term “international financial institution” means the International Monetary Fund, International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, International Development Association, International Finance Corporation, Multilateral Investment Guarantee Agency, African Development Bank, African Development Fund, Asian Development Bank, Inter-American Development Bank, Bank for Economic Cooperation and Development in the Middle East and North Africa, and Inter-American Investment Corporation.

(d) TERMINATION.—This section shall terminate on the day after the earlier of—

- (1) the date on which the Secretary of State certifies and reports to the appropriate congressional committees that the requirements of subsection (a) are met; or
- (2) 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(e) WAIVER.—The President may waive this section if the President determines that such a waiver is in the national interest of the United States.

SEC. 5. ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that, according to the Organization of American States (OAS) report on the Nicaraguan 2011 Presidential elections, Nicaragua: Final Report, General Elections, OAS (2011), the OAS made the following recommendations to the Government of Nicaragua:

- (1) “Prepare alternative procedures for updating the electoral roll when a registered voter dies.”
- (2) “Publish the electoral roll so that new additions, changes of address and exclusions can be checked.”
- (3) “Reform the mechanism for accreditation of poll watchers using a formula that ensures that the political parties will have greater autonomy to accredit their respective poll watchers.”

(4) “Institute regulations to ensure that party poll watchers are involved in all areas

of the electoral structure, including the departmental, regional and municipal electoral councils and polling stations. Rules should be crafted to spell out their authorities and functions and the means by which they can exercise their authority and perform their functions.”.

(5) “Redesign the CSE administrative structure at the central and field levels, while standardizing technical and operational procedures, including the design of control mechanisms from the time registration to the delivery of the document to the citizens; the process of issuing identity cards should be timed to the calendar and, to avoid congestion within the process, be evenly spaced.”.

(b) ELECTORAL OBSERVATION MISSION.—The President shall direct the United States Permanent Representative to the Organization of American States (OAS) to use the voice, vote, and influence of the United States at the OAS to strongly advocate for an Electoral Observation Mission to be sent to Nicaragua in 2016 and 2017.

SEC. 6. STATEMENT OF POLICY.

The Department of State and the United States Agency for International Development should prioritize foreign assistance to the people of Nicaragua to assist civil society in democracy and governance programs, including human rights documentation.

SEC. 7. REPORT ON CORRUPTION IN NICARAGUA.

(a) REPORT REQUIREMENT.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State, in consultation with the intelligence community (as defined in section 3(4) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003(4)), shall submit to Congress a report on the involvement of senior Nicaraguan government officials, including members of the Supreme Electoral Council, the National Assembly, and the judicial system, in acts of public corruption or human rights violations in Nicaragua.

(b) FORM.—The report required in subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may contain a classified annex. The unclassified portion of the report shall be made available to the public.

Mr. ROYCE (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: “A bill to oppose loans at international financial institutions for the Government of Nicaragua, other than to address basic human needs or promote democracy, unless the Government of Nicaragua is taking effective steps to hold free, fair, and transparent elections, and for other purposes.”.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STABILITY AND DEMOCRACY FOR UKRAINE ACT

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5094) to contain, reverse, and deter Russian aggression in Ukraine, to assist Ukraine’s democratic transition, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.
The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5094

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE AND TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the “Stability and Democracy for Ukraine Act” or “STAND for Ukraine Act”.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title and table of contents.

Sec. 2. Statements of policy.

TITLE I—CRIMEA ANNEXATION NON-RECOGNITION

Sec. 101. United States policy against recognition of territorial changes effected by force alone.

Sec. 102. Prohibitions against United States recognition of the Russian Federation’s annexation of Crimea.

Sec. 103. Determinations and codification of sanctions under Executive Order 13685.

TITLE II—SANCTIONS PROVISIONS

Sec. 201. Prohibiting certain transactions with foreign sanctions evaders and serious human rights abusers with respect to the Russian Federation.

Sec. 202. Report on certain foreign financial institutions.

Sec. 203. Requirements relating to transfers of defense articles and defense services to the Russian Federation.

TITLE III—OTHER MATTERS

Sec. 301. Strategy to respond to Russian Federation-supported information and propaganda efforts directed toward Russian-speaking communities in countries bordering the Russian Federation.

Sec. 302. Cost limitation.

Sec. 303. Sunset.

SEC. 2. STATEMENTS OF POLICY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—It is the policy of the United States to further assist the Government of Ukraine in restoring its sovereignty and territorial integrity to contain, reverse, and deter Russian aggression in Ukraine. That policy shall be carried into effect, among other things, through a comprehensive effort, in coordination with allies and partners of the United States where appropriate, that includes sanctions, diplomacy, and assistance, including lethal defensive weapons systems, for the people of Ukraine intended to enhance their ability to consolidate a rule of law-based democracy with a free market economy and to exercise their right under international law to self-defense.

(b) ADDITIONAL STATEMENT OF POLICY.—It is further the policy of the United States—

(1) to use its voice, vote, and influence in international fora to encourage others to provide assistance that is similar to assistance described in subsection (a) to Ukraine; and

(2) to ensure that any relevant sanctions relief for the Russian Federation is contingent on timely, complete, and verifiable implementation of the Minsk Agreements, especially the restoration of Ukraine’s control of the entirety of its eastern border with the Russian Federation in the conflict zone.

TITLE I—CRIMEA ANNEXATION NON-RECOGNITION

SEC. 101. UNITED STATES POLICY AGAINST RECOGNITION OF TERRITORIAL CHANGES EFFECTED BY FORCE ALONE.

Between the years of 1940 and 1991, the United States did not recognize the forcible

incorporation and annexation of the three Baltic States of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia into the Soviet Union under a policy known as the “Stimson Doctrine”.

SEC. 102. PROHIBITIONS AGAINST UNITED STATES RECOGNITION OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION’S ANNEXATION OF CRIMEA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In accordance with United States policy enumerated in section 101, no Federal department or agency should take any action or extend any assistance that recognizes or implies any recognition of the de jure or de facto sovereignty of the Russian Federation over Crimea, its airspace, or its territorial waters.

(b) DOCUMENTS PORTRAYING CRIMEA AS PART OF RUSSIAN FEDERATION.—In accordance with United States policy enumerated in section 101, the Government Printing Office should not print any map, document, record, or other paper of the United States portraying or otherwise indicating Crimea as part of the territory of the Russian Federation.

SEC. 103. DETERMINATIONS AND CODIFICATION OF SANCTIONS UNDER EXECUTIVE ORDER 13685.

(a) DETERMINATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that contains the assessment described in paragraph (2).

(2) ASSESSMENT DESCRIBED.—The assessment described in this paragraph is—

(A) a review of each person designated pursuant to Executive Order 13660 (March 6, 2014; 79 Fed. Reg. 13493; relating to blocking property of certain persons contributing to the situation in Ukraine) or Executive Order 13661 (March 16, 2014; 79 Fed. Reg. 15535; relating to blocking property of additional persons contributing to the situation in Ukraine); and

(B) a determination as to whether any such person meets the criteria for designation pursuant to Executive Order 13685 (December 19, 2014; 79 Fed. Reg. 77357; relating to blocking property of certain persons and prohibiting certain transactions with respect to the Crimea region of Ukraine).

(3) FORM.—The assessment required by paragraph (2) shall be submitted in unclassified form but may contain a classified annex.

(b) CODIFICATION.—United States sanctions provided for in Executive Order 13685, as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act, shall remain in effect until the date on which the President submits to the appropriate congressional committees a certification described in subsection (c).

(c) CERTIFICATION.—A certification described in this subsection is a certification of the President that Ukraine’s sovereignty over Crimea has been restored.

(d) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to restrict the authority of the President to impose additional United States sanctions with specific respect to the Russian Federation’s occupation of Crimea pursuant to Executive Order 13685.

(e) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—In this section, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(1) the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Financial Services, and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives; and

(2) Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate.

TITLE II—SANCTIONS PROVISIONS

SEC. 201. PROHIBITING CERTAIN TRANSACTIONS WITH FOREIGN SANCTIONS EVADERS AND SERIOUS HUMAN RIGHTS ABUSERS WITH RESPECT TO THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.

The Support for the Sovereignty, Integrity, Democracy, and Economic Stability of Ukraine Act of 2014 (Public Law 113-95; 22 U.S.C. 8901 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new sections:

"SEC. 10. PROHIBITING CERTAIN TRANSACTIONS WITH FOREIGN SANCTIONS EVADERS WITH RESPECT TO THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—The President is authorized to impose with respect to a foreign person the sanctions described in subsection (b) if the President determines that the foreign person knowingly—

"(1) has materially violated, attempted to violate, conspired to violate, or caused a violation of any license, order, regulation, or prohibition contained in, or issued pursuant to any covered Executive order; or

"(2) has facilitated significant deceptive or structured transactions for or on behalf of any person subject to United States sanctions concerning the Russian Federation.

"(b) SANCTIONS DESCRIBED.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The sanctions described in this subsection are the exercise of all powers granted to the President by the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) to the extent necessary to block and prohibit all transactions in all property and interests in property of a person determined by the President to be subject to subsection (a) if such property and interests in property are in the United States, come within the United States, or are or come within the possession or control of a United States person.

"(2) PENALTIES.—A person that is subject to sanctions described in paragraph (1) shall be subject to the penalties set forth in subsections (b) and (c) of section 206 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1705) to the same extent as a person that commits an unlawful act described in subsection (a) of that section.

"(c) WAIVER.—The President may waive the application of sanctions under subsection (b) on a case-by-case for a period of not more than 120 days, and may renew that waiver for additional periods of not more than 120 days with respect to a person if the President determines that such a waiver is in the national interests of the United States and on or before the date on which the waiver takes effect, submits to the appropriate congressional committees a notice of and justification for the waiver.

"(d) IMPLEMENTATION AUTHORITY.—The President may exercise all authorities provided to the President under sections 203 and 205 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1702 and 1704) for purposes of carrying out this section.

"(e) REGULATORY AUTHORITY.—The President shall issue such regulations, licenses, and orders as are necessary to carry out this section.

"(f) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

"(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term 'appropriate congressional committees' means—

"(A) the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Financial Services, and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives; and

"(B) Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate.

"(2) COVERED EXECUTIVE ORDER.—The term 'covered Executive order' means any of the following:

"(A) Executive Order 13660 (March 6, 2014; 79 Fed. Reg. 13493; relating to blocking prop-

erty of certain persons contributing to the situation in Ukraine).

"(B) Executive Order 13661 (March 16, 2014; 79 Fed. Reg. 15535; relating to blocking property of additional persons contributing to the situation in Ukraine).

"(C) Executive Order 13685 (December 19, 2014; 79 Fed. Reg. 77357; relating to blocking property of certain persons and prohibiting certain transactions with respect to the Crimea region of Ukraine).

"(3) FOREIGN PERSON.—The term 'foreign person' has the meaning given such term in section 595.304 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations, as in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

"(4) STRUCTURED.—The term 'structured', with respect to a transaction, has the meaning given the term 'structure' in paragraph (xx) of section 1010.100 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations.

"(5) UNITED STATES PERSON.—The term 'United States person' has the meaning given such term in section 589.312 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations, as in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

"SEC. 11. PROHIBITING CERTAIN TRANSACTIONS IN AREAS CONTROLLED BY THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—The President is authorized to impose with respect to a foreign person the sanctions described in subsection (b) if the President determines that the foreign person, based on credible information—

"(1) is responsible for, complicit in, or responsible for ordering, controlling, or otherwise directing, the commission of serious human rights abuses in any territory forcibly occupied or otherwise controlled by the Government of the Russian Federation;

"(2) has materially assisted, sponsored, or provided financial, material, or technological support for, or goods or services to, a foreign person that is responsible for, complicit in, or responsible for ordering, controlling, or otherwise directing, the commission of serious human rights abuses in any territory forcibly occupied or otherwise controlled by the Government of the Russian Federation; or

"(3) is owned or controlled by a foreign person, or has acted or purported to act for or on behalf of, directly or indirectly, a foreign person, that is responsible for, complicit in, or responsible for ordering, controlling, or otherwise directing, the commission of serious human rights abuses in any territory forcibly occupied or otherwise controlled by the Government of the Russian Federation.

"(b) SANCTIONS DESCRIBED.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The sanctions described in this subsection are the exercise of all powers granted to the President by the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.), without regard to section 202 of such Act, to the extent necessary to block and prohibit all transactions in all property and interests in property of a person determined by the President to be subject to subsection (a) if such property and interests in property are in the United States, come within the United States, or are or come within the possession or control of a United States person.

"(2) PENALTIES.—A person that is subject to sanctions described in paragraph (1) shall be subject to the penalties set forth in subsections (b) and (c) of section 206 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1705) to the same extent as a person that commits an unlawful act described in subsection (a) of that section.

"(c) WAIVER.—The President may waive the application of sanctions under subsection (b) on a case-by-case for a period of not more than 120 days, and may renew that waiver for additional periods of not more than 120 days with respect to a person if the President de-

termines that such a waiver is in the national interests of the United States and on or before the date on which the waiver takes effect, submits to the appropriate congressional committees a notice of and justification for the waiver.

"(d) IMPLEMENTATION AUTHORITY.—The President may exercise all authorities provided to the President under sections 203 and 205 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1702 and 1704) for purposes of carrying out this section.

"(e) REGULATORY AUTHORITY.—The President shall issue such regulations, licenses, and orders as are necessary to carry out this section.

"(f) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

"(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term 'appropriate congressional committees' means—

"(A) the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Financial Services, and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives; and

"(B) Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate.

"(2) FOREIGN PERSON.—The term 'foreign person' has the meaning given such term in section 595.304 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations, as in effect on the date of enactment of this section.

"(3) UNITED STATES PERSON.—The term 'United States person' has the meaning given such term in section 589.312 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations, as in effect on the date of enactment of this section."

SEC. 202. REPORT ON CERTAIN FOREIGN FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS.

The Support for the Sovereignty, Integrity, Democracy, and Economic Stability of Ukraine Act of 2014 (Public Law 113-95; 22 U.S.C. 8901 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 11 (as added by section 201 of this Act) the following new section:

"SEC. 12. REPORT ON CERTAIN FOREIGN FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this section, the Secretary of State and the Secretary of the Treasury shall jointly submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on—

"(1) foreign financial institutions that are in direct control of assets owned or controlled by the Government of Ukraine in a manner determined by the Secretary of State and the Secretary of the Treasury to be in violation of the sovereignty, independence, or territorial integrity of Ukraine;

"(2) foreign financial institutions that are directly or indirectly assisting or otherwise aiding the violation of sovereignty, independence, and territorial integrity of Ukraine; and

"(3) foreign financial institutions determined by the Secretary of State and the Secretary of the Treasury to be complicit in illicit financial activity, including money laundering, financing of terrorism, transnational organized crime, or misappropriation of state assets, that are—

"(A) organized under the laws of the Russian Federation; or

"(B) owned or controlled by a foreign person whose property or interests in property have been blocked pursuant to any covered Executive order.

"(b) FORM.—The report required to be submitted under this subsection shall be submitted in unclassified form but may include a classified annex.

"(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

"(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term 'appropriate congressional committees' means—

“(A) the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Financial Services, the Committee on Ways and Means, and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives; and

“(B) Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate.

“(2) COVERED EXECUTIVE ORDER.—The term ‘covered Executive order’ has the meaning given the term in section 10(f) of this Act.”.

SEC. 203. REQUIREMENTS RELATING TO TRANSFERS OF DEFENSE ARTICLES AND DEFENSE SERVICES TO THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.

(a) STATEMENT OF POLICY.—It is the policy of the United States to oppose the transfer of defense articles and defense services from any country that is a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) to, or on behalf of, the Russian Federation, during any period in which the Russian Federation forcibly occupies the territory of Ukraine or of a NATO member country.

(b) ADOPTION OF NATO POLICY.—The President shall use the voice, vote, and influence of the United States in NATO to seek the adoption of a policy by NATO that is consistent with the policy of the United States specified in subsection (a).

(c) MONITORING AND IDENTIFICATION OF TRANSFERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The President shall direct the heads of the appropriate departments and agencies of the United States to identify those transfers of defense articles and defense services described in subsection (a) that are contrary to the policy of the United States specified in subsection (a).

(2) REPORT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The President shall submit a written report to the chairmen and ranking members of the appropriate committees of Congress within 5 days of the receipt of information indicating that a transfer described in paragraph (1) has occurred.

(B) FORM.—The report required under subparagraph (A) shall be submitted in unclassified form but may include a classified annex.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS.—The term ‘‘appropriate committees of Congress’’ means—

(A) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives; and

(B) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate.

(2) DEFENSE ARTICLES AND DEFENSE SERVICES.—The terms ‘‘defense article’’ and ‘‘defense service’’ have the meanings given such terms in section 47 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2794 note).

TITLE III—OTHER MATTERS

SEC. 301. STRATEGY TO RESPOND TO RUSSIAN FEDERATION-SUPPORTED INFORMATION AND PROPAGANDA EFFORTS DIRECTED TOWARD RUSSIAN-SPEAKING COMMUNITIES IN COUNTRIES BORDERING THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall develop and implement a strategy to respond to Russian Federation-supported dis-information and propaganda efforts directed toward persons in countries bordering the Russian Federation.

(b) MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.—The strategy required under subsection (a) should include the following:

(1) Development of a response to propaganda and dis-information campaigns as an

element of the ongoing crisis in Ukraine, specifically—

(A) assistance in building the capacity of the Ukrainian military to document conflict zones and disseminate information in real-time;

(B) assistance in enhancing broadcast capacity with terrestrial television transmitters in Eastern Ukraine; and

(C) media training for officials of the Government of Ukraine.

(2) Establishment of a partnership with partner governments and private-sector entities to provide Russian-language entertainment and news content to broadcasters in Russian-speaking communities bordering the Russian Federation.

(3) Assessment of the extent of Russian Federation influence in political parties, financial institutions, media organizations, and other entities seeking to exert political influence and sway public opinion in favor of Russian Federation policy across Europe.

(c) REPORT.—The Secretary of State shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the strategy required under subsection (a) and its implementation.

(d) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—In this section, the term ‘‘appropriate congressional committees’’ means—

(1) the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives; and

(2) the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate.

SEC. 302. COST LIMITATION.

No additional funds are authorized 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.

SEC. 303. SUNSET.

This Act and the amendments made by this Act shall cease to be effective beginning on the date that is 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROYCE. 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 this measure.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, the people of Ukraine have struggled against great odds to defend their freedom and ensure their national existence. It is a tortured history.

One of the Members who is on the floor today, ELIOT ENGEL, who was in Ukraine with me, his family, grandparents, all four of them came from Ukraine. Together we saw some of the evidence of that history in a gorge in Ukraine where so many Jewish Ukrainians were slaughtered. It is a reminder. The Holocaust and the other deprivations, the famine that Ukrainians lived through, are a reminder of the perils to the people in that country.

For several years, Vladimir Putin has employed all of the tools at his command to dominate that country, and that includes arming separatists in the east where almost 10,000 people have lost their lives in the fighting. It includes annexing Crimea, and the latest effort to legitimize his aggression was to include Crimea in Russia’s parliamentary elections held last Sunday. These were a sham, and the delegates represent no one but the rulers in Moscow.

The administration cannot allow Putin to believe that U.S. opposition to his aggression is weakening. Instead, the U.S. and its allies and partners in Europe must step up their pressure against Moscow, including providing the lethal assistance needed to stop Russian tanks, that the Ukrainians have repeatedly asked for. Their primary concern is to be able to check that armor in the east.

This legislation strengthens the sanctions imposed on Russia as well. It is a clear demonstration that the U.S. remains committed to supporting the Ukrainian peoples’ unyielding defense of their freedom and their national existence.

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

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,

Washington, DC, September 15, 2016.

Hon. EDWARD R. ROYCE,

Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN ROYCE, I am writing with respect to H.R. 5094, the ‘‘Stability and Democracy for Ukraine Act,’’ on which the Committee on Ways and Means was granted an additional referral.

In order to allow H.R. 5094 to move expeditiously to the House floor, I agree to waive formal consideration of this bill. The Committee on Ways and Means takes this action with the mutual understanding that by forgoing formal consideration of H.R. 5094, we do not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this or similar legislation, and the Committee will be appropriately consulted and involved as the bill or similar legislation moves forward so that we may address any remaining issues that fall within our Rule X jurisdiction. The Committee also reserves the right to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this or similar legislation, and requests your support for such request.

Finally, I would appreciate your response to this letter confirming this understanding, and would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Congressional Record during floor consideration thereof.

Sincerely,

KEVIN BRADY,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,

Washington, DC., September 15, 2016.

Hon. KEVIN BRADY,

Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN BRADY: Thank you for consulting with the Foreign Affairs Committee and agreeing to be discharged from further

consideration of H.R. 5094, the STAND for Ukraine Act, so that the bill may proceed expeditiously to the House floor.

I agree that your forgoing further action on this measure does not in any way diminish or alter the jurisdiction of your committee, or prejudice its jurisdictional prerogatives on this resolution or similar legislation in the future. I would support your effort to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees from your committee to any House-Senate conference on this legislation.

I will seek to place our letters on H.R. 5094 into the Congressional Record during floor consideration of the resolution. I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation and look forward to continuing to work together as this measure moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

EDWARD R. ROYCE,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES,
Washington, DC, September 16, 2016.

Hon. ED ROYCE,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN ROYCE: I am writing concerning H.R. 5094, the "STAND for Ukraine Act."

As a result of your having consulted with the Committee on Financial Services concerning provisions in the bill that fall within our Rule X jurisdiction, I agree to forgo action on the bill so that it may proceed expeditiously to the House Floor. The Committee on Financial Services takes this action with our mutual understanding that, by foregoing consideration of H.R. 5094 at this time, we do not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this or similar legislation, and that our Committee will be appropriately consulted and involved as this or similar legislation moves forward so that we may address any remaining issues that fall within our Rule X jurisdiction. Our Committee also reserves the right to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this or similar legislation, and requests your support for any such request.

Finally, I would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of the legislation.

Sincerely,

JEB HENSARLING,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, September 15, 2016.

Hon. JEB HENSARLING,
Chairman, Committee on Financial Services, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN HENSARLING: Thank you for consulting with the Foreign Affairs Committee and agreeing to be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 5094, the STAND for Ukraine Act, so that the bill may proceed expeditiously to the House floor.

I agree that your forgoing further action on this measure does not in any way diminish or alter the jurisdiction of your committee, or prejudice its jurisdictional prerogatives on this resolution or similar legislation in the future. I would support your effort to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees from your committee to any House-Senate conference on this legislation.

I will seek to place our letters on H.R. 5094 into the Congressional Record during floor consideration of the resolution. I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation

and look forward to continuing to work together as this measure moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

EDWARD R. ROYCE,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, DC, September 16, 2016.

Hon. EDWARD R. ROYCE,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN ROYCE: I write with respect to H.R. 5094, the "STAND for Ukraine Act," which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary among others. As a result of your having consulted with us on provisions within H.R. 5094 that fall within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary, I agree to discharge our committee from further consideration of this bill so that it may proceed expeditiously to the House floor for consideration.

The Judiciary Committee takes this action with our mutual understanding that by foregoing consideration of H.R. 5094 at this time, we do not waive any jurisdiction over subject matter contained in this or similar legislation and that our committee will be appropriately consulted and involved as this bill or similar legislation moves forward so that we may address any remaining issues in our jurisdiction. Our committee also reserves the right to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this or similar legislation and asks that you support any such request.

I would appreciate a response to this letter confirming this understanding with respect to H.R. 5094 and would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in your committee report and in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of H.R. 5094.

Sincerely,

BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, September 15, 2016.

Hon. BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN GOODLATTE: Thank you for consulting with the Foreign Affairs Committee and agreeing to be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 5094, the STAND for Ukraine Act, so that the bill may proceed expeditiously to the House floor.

I agree that your forgoing further action on this measure does not in any way diminish or alter the jurisdiction of your committee, or prejudice its jurisdictional prerogatives on this resolution or similar legislation in the future. I would support your effort to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees from your committee to any House-Senate conference on this legislation.

I will seek to place our letters on RR. 5094 into the Congressional Record during floor consideration of the resolution. I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation and look forward to continuing to work together as this measure moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

EDWARD R. ROYCE,
Chairman.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill. Let me, first of all, thank our

chairman, ED ROYCE, for helping advance this bill. I introduced this bill in April along with the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KINZINGER). I am proud to say we now have 36 additional cosponsors, both Democrats and Republicans.

Mr. Speaker, we shouldn't kid ourselves about the intentions of Russia's President, Vladimir Putin. Inside his own borders, he has stripped away the rights of Russia's citizens. He has silenced a free and open press. He has stolen countless billions and spread the wealth around to his cronies. And in the wake of a sham election that boosted his party's majority, it is being reported that he wants to breathe new life into the KGB.

His record abroad is more of the same. He has trampled his neighbors' sovereignty, worked to undermine NATO and Western unity, and posed a real threat to America's work and the work of our friends over the past seven decades to build a Europe that is whole, free, and at peace.

Perhaps most egregious is Russia's ongoing illegal occupation of Crimea and parts of eastern Ukraine. Russia recently renewed its attack on Ukraine's sovereignty by holding parliamentary elections for the duma in Crimea. It is just outrageous, as the chairman mentioned. The United States will never recognize these claims, just as we never recognized Soviet control of the Baltic States during the 50-year occupation there.

My legislation underscores America's support for Ukraine's right to defend itself, and it keeps pressure on Russia so long as Russia's criminal behavior in Ukraine continues. This bill says that if Russia wants to see sanctions relief, it must abide by its Minsk Agreement obligations, namely, if Ukraine controls the entirety of its eastern border. It makes Crimea-related sanctions permanent so long as the Russian occupation there continues. It tightens sanctions enforcement with the new anti-evasion framework, and it requires reporting on banks illegally controlling Ukrainian assets, particularly Russian banks in Crimea.

This bill also takes steps to make it harder for Russia to buy defense equipment or services from our NATO allies. It goes after human rights abusers in Russian-occupied areas, and it calls for a comprehensive strategy from our own government to push back against Russian propaganda. The people of Ukraine need to know the United States stands with them. This Government of Ukraine is the most pro-Western government they have ever had. We need to help them. Vladimir Putin needs to know that his reckless ambition won't go unanswered.

The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL) had to leave, but he submitted testimony. He strongly supports this bill and everything that the chairman and I are saying this evening. I ask that all Members support this bill.

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

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD).

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman. I just want to come to applaud both the chairman and the ranking member for their work on this important measure.

I think this bill is incredibly important because, in the simplest of forms, conflicting signals never work with regard to foreign policy. Some people have said that the Korean war was, in many cases, in large measure created based on a void as to uncertainty as to what the American Government would or wouldn't do in the event that North Korea was attacked by South Korea. I think you can look at a long host of different examples that point to the simple fact that conflicting signals are never a good signal when it comes to foreign policy.

I just want to thank the gentlemen for their resolution and to stress its importance. I think if we learned anything in the days leading up to World War II, with the actions of Neville Chamberlain, it is that appeasement doesn't work and that unchecked aggression always creates problems.

I think this is about sending a clear message to the Russians, but it ultimately sends a message to more than just the Russians. This is, as well, about a message to the Chinese in the South China Sea or other parts around the globe. In that regard, I think that this bill is ultimately about things that are ultimately much bigger than Ukraine and Russia.

Let me give you two examples. One, this is about reminding our allies and even ourselves that, for sovereignty to mean anything, a border has to mean something. That means a border can't be porous. It means that a border can't be regulated and controlled by whoever your biggest and strongest neighbor is in the region.

I would say, secondly, that this is about what it means to be an American ally. I think that the Budapest Memorandum was unequivocally clear that, if you give up nuclear arms, we will do certain things in terms of your security.

So the question that we now have to ask as Americans, and I think what this bill ultimately does so forcefully is to say: What does that mean and what are we going to do about it? Indeed, that is the question.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

Let me say before I close that Mr. SANFORD was absolutely right in what he just said. The fact is that Ukraine, which was part of the Soviet Union, gave up its nuclear weapons when the Soviet Union collapsed. As a result, they were given assurances that they would not have aggression perpetrated against them; and, of course, like other promises made by Mr. Putin, that fell by the wayside. I agree with the gen-

tleman from South Carolina. I think he is absolutely right on the money. I thank him for his remarks.

Mr. Speaker, we have no shortage of crises smoldering around the world, but we cannot take our eye off what is happening in Ukraine and the threat that Russia poses. NATO is being tested. Western democracy is being called into question. The progress we have made since the cold war is at risk.

Even if the administration is trying to work with Russia on other issues, we need to be clear-eyed when Vladimir Putin flouts international law and threatens the security of Europe. This bill would say plainly that no matter what happens in other parts of the world, if Russia continues to illegally occupy parts of Ukraine, Russia will pay a price.

I am pleased that the House is acting on my bill. I want to again thank Chairman ROYCE for being a partner with me and helping with this bill. I ask that all Members support it.

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

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL), the ranking member.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, as an original sponsor of the STAND for Ukraine Act and a Co-Chair of the Congressional Ukraine Caucus, I rise in support of this important measure. This bill codifies and tightens existing U.S. sanctions on Russia for its violation of Ukraine's territorial integrity, including its illegal annexation of Crimea.

In passing this measure, I join my colleagues in making a strong statement that the United States stands with the people of Ukraine. Earlier this month, we celebrated the 25th anniversary of Ukraine's independence. It is the Ukraine people's will for a free, democratic, and sovereign country that is the underlying impetus for change and international support.

I believe we have a duty to stand behind democratic nations such as Ukraine against foreign aggression, and it is in our national interest to have an ally who shares our values. The STAND for Ukraine Act takes a meaningful step in helping Ukraine defend against foreign aggression. At the same time, we must continue our work in helping Ukraine develop the rule of law, root out corruption, and bring about economic prosperity.

I support the STAND for Ukraine Act, and urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the STAND for Ukraine Act. I'd like to thank my good friend and colleague Mr. ENGEL for introducing this legislation, which aims to solidify U.S. support for Ukraine's territorial integrity, under assault by the Russian government since 2014.

Last weekend Russian-occupied Crimea took part in Russia's parliamentary elections for the first time since Russia took over the peninsula in 2014. In the judgment of OSCE election observers, the elections took place in an environment marked by "restrictions to fundamental freedoms and political rights, firmly controlled media and a tightening grip on civil society. . . ." In timely response, this legislation solidifies the U.S. commitment to the territorial integrity of Ukraine.

The administration has applied various sanctions to Russia. In its leading provisions, this bill will give the sanctions created by executive orders the permanence of statutory law—until Ukraine's sovereignty over Crimea is fully restored. These sanctions relate to blocking property of certain persons contributing to the situation in Ukraine. In addition, the bill provides that no federal agency shall take any action or extend any assistance that recognizes Russian sovereignty over Crimea.

Mr. Speaker, the Russian government's invasion of Ukraine, and particularly its land grab in Crimea—its forcible, illegal attempt to incorporate that peninsula into Russia—violated the core principles of several bilateral and multilateral agreements and treaties, including all ten of the core principles of the Helsinki Final Act.

In July I led the U.S. delegation to the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly, which met this year in Tbilisi. Russian parliamentarians continually sought to undermine, and even demean and provoke the Ukrainian delegation. Mr. Speaker, our delegation provided strong and constant support for the Ukrainians. In the words of this bill's policy statement, we used our "voice, vote, and influence in international fora to encourage others to provide assistance" to Ukraine, particularly to restore its sovereignty and territorial integrity. In my own speeches, I focused on the issue of Crimea, and on the sharply declining human rights situation there.

Russian "anti-extremism" laws have been used to criminalize opposition and stifle free speech. The majority of victims have been Crimean Tatars and ethnic Ukrainians, who have been subject to killings, kidnappings, torture, harassment and intimidation.

I urge my House colleagues to support this measure that will ensure the United States' non-recognition of Russia's illegal occupation, solidify and sharpen sanctions against Russia over Crimea, and support the full territorial integrity of Ukraine.

Mr. PASCARELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to stand in solidarity with my brothers and sisters in Ukraine by urging my colleagues to swiftly pass the STAND for Ukraine Act.

Nearly two and a half years ago, Russian President Vladimir Putin undermined Ukrainian sovereignty when the Russians began illegally occupying Crimea.

This act emboldened him to double down on bullying his neighbors, testing the resolve of NATO and trying to fracture Western unity.

His disrespect for global order knows no bounds. That is why the United States must reiterate to the world that it will not tolerate Russia's aggression.

While some misguided people have said that "Putin is not going into Crimea," this bill makes it perfectly clear: Russia's illegal occupation of Crimea will not be tolerated by the United States.

We must hold Russia accountable for its disrespect for global order and continued violations of international law.

That is why I am a strong supporter and co-sponsor of the STAND for Ukraine Act, which tightens sanctions on Russia and rejects any form of recognition of Russian rule over Crimea.

Mr. Speaker, I hope this bill will become law quickly so we can make sure that President Putin knows the United States stands with our ally Ukraine.

Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 5094.

Ukraine continues to face significant challenges from Russian meddling and aggression. We in Congress are under no illusions when seeing Vladimir Putin's true intentions for Ukraine.

Vladimir Putin and Russia are tearing Europe apart. Russian-backed separatists continue their shelling of Ukrainian military positions in Donetsk and Donbass, which in some cases has killed civilians.

Additionally, Vladimir Putin and Russia are delivering bombs on medical facilities and on children in Syria. Further proof that they are no ally of ours.

Rather than continuing to negotiate with Putin, we need to stand up to him. The best way to push back against Russia is to give the Ukrainians what they need to defend their sovereign territory, such as lethal weaponry to counter the Russian-backed "little green men."

This important bill does a number of things to continue to show American support for Ukraine, while also putting additional pressure on Russia for its continued violation of Ukraine's territorial sovereignty.

Most importantly, this bill states that the United States will never recognize Russian sovereignty over Crimea, which it illegally annexed in 2014.

This bill would also enhance our sanctions regime on Russia for its ongoing illegal and destabilizing activities against Ukraine.

In our history, we have always seen the impact that our nation has on others when we stand up and help them achieve a better tomorrow. It is imperative that we continue to help Ukraine achieve that better future for its citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I was proud to work with Congressman ELIOT ENGEL to introduce this critical bill. By reaffirming U.S. support for Ukraine's self-defense, emphasizing that we never have nor will recognize Russia's illegal annexation of Crimea, and by holding Russia accountable for its continued violation of Ukraine's sovereignty, we will 'Stand with Ukraine' legislatively and most effectively.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5094, 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.

GLOBAL DEVELOPMENT LAB ACT OF 2016

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3924) to establish in the United States Agency for International Development an entity to be known as the United States Global Development Lab, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.
The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3924

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 "Global Development Lab Act of 2016".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) The effectiveness of United States foreign assistance can be greatly enhanced by fostering innovation, applying science and technology, and leveraging the expertise and resources of the private sector to find low-cost, common sense solutions to today's most pressing development challenges.

(2) Breakthroughs that accelerate economic growth and produce better health outcomes in developing countries can help support the growth of healthier, more stable societies and foster trade relationships that translate into jobs and economic growth in the United States.

(3) In 2014, the Office of Science and Technology and the Office of Innovation and Development Alliances at the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) were streamlined and merged into the United States Global Development Lab.

(4) The Lab partners with entrepreneurs, experts, nongovernmental organizations, universities, and science and research institutions to find solutions to specific development challenges in a faster, more cost-efficient, and more sustainable way.

(5) The Lab utilizes competitive innovation incentive awards, a "pay-for-success" model, whereby a development challenge is identified, competitions are launched, ideas with the greatest potential for success are selected and tested, and awards are provided only after the objectives of a competition have been substantially achieved.

(6) Enhancing the authorities that support this pay-for-success model will better enable the Lab to diversify and expand both the number and sources of ideas that may be developed, tested, and brought to scale, thereby increasing USAID's opportunity to apply high value, low-cost solutions to specific development challenges.

SEC. 3. UNITED STATES GLOBAL DEVELOPMENT LAB.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in USAID an entity to be known as the United States Global Development Lab.

(b) DUTIES.—The duties of the Lab shall include—

(1) increasing the application of science, technology, innovation and partnerships to develop and scale new solutions to end extreme poverty;

(2) discovering, testing, and scaling development innovations to increase cost effectiveness and support United States foreign policy and development goals;

(3) leveraging the expertise, resources, and investment of businesses, nongovernmental organizations, science and research organizations, and universities to increase program impact and sustainability;

(4) utilizing innovation-driven competitions to expand the number and diversity of solutions to development challenges; and

(5) supporting USAID missions and bureaus in applying science, technology, innovation, and partnership approaches to decision-making, procurement, and program design.

(c) AUTHORITIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out the duties of the Lab under subsection (b), the Administrator, in addition to such other authorities as may be available to the Administrator, including authorities under part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2151 et seq.), and subject to the limitations described in paragraph (3), is authorized to—

(A) provide innovation incentive awards (as defined in section 4(5) of this Act); and

(B) use funds made available to carry out the provisions of part I of the Foreign Assist-

ance Act of 1961 for each of the fiscal years 2017 through 2021 for the employment of not more than 30 individuals on a limited term basis pursuant to schedule A of subpart C of part 213 of title 5, Code of Federal Regulations, or similar provisions of law or regulations.

(2) RECOVERY OF FUNDS.—

(A) AUTHORITY.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out the duties of the Lab under subsection (b), the Administrator, subject to the limitation described in clause (ii), is authorized to require a person or entity that receives funding under a grant, contract, or cooperative agreement made by the Lab to return to the Lab any program income that is attributable to funding under such grant, contract, or cooperative agreement.

(ii) LIMITATION.—The amount of program income that a person or entity is required to return to the Lab under clause (i) shall not exceed the amount of funding that the person or entity received under the grant, contract, or cooperative agreement.

(B) TREATMENT OF PAYMENTS.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The amount of any program income returned to the Lab pursuant to subparagraph (A) may be credited to the account from which the obligation and expenditure of funds under the grant, contract, or cooperative agreement described in subparagraph (A) was made.

(ii) AVAILABILITY.—

(I) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subclause (II), amounts returned and credited to an account under clause (i)—

(aa) shall be merged with other funds in the account; and

(bb) shall be available, subject to appropriation, for the same purposes and period of time for which other funds in the account are available for programs and activities of the Lab.

(II) EXCEPTION.—Amounts returned and credited to an account under clause (i) may not be used to pay for the employment of individuals described in paragraph (1)(B).

(3) LIMITATIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Concurrent with the submission of the Congressional Budget Justification for Foreign Operations for each fiscal year, the Administrator shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a detailed accounting of USAID's use of authorities under this section, including the sources, amounts, and uses of funding under each of paragraphs (1) and (2).

(B) INNOVATION INCENTIVE AWARDS.—In providing innovation incentive awards under paragraph (1)(A), the Administrator shall—

(i) limit the amount of individual awards for fiscal year 2017 to not more than \$100,000;

(ii) limit the total number of awards for fiscal year 2017 to not more than 10 awards; and

(iii) notify the appropriate congressional committees not later than 15 days after providing each such award.

(C) STAFF.—In exercising the authority under paragraph (1)(B), the Administrator should seek to ensure that increases in the number of staff assigned to the Lab are offset by an equivalent reduction in the total number of staff serving elsewhere in USAID.

SEC. 4. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) ADMINISTRATOR.—The term "Administrator" means the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development.

(2) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term "appropriate congressional committees" means—

(A) the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives; and

(B) the Committees on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate.

(3) LAB.—The term “Lab” means the United States Global Development Lab established under section 3.

(4) USAID.—The term “USAID” means the United States Agency for International Development.

(5) INNOVATION INCENTIVE AWARD.—The term “innovation incentive award” means the provision of funding on a competitive basis that—

(A) encourages and rewards the development of solutions for a particular, well-defined problem relating to the alleviation of poverty; or

(B) helps identify and promote a broad range of ideas and practices, facilitating further development of an idea or practice by third parties.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

□ 2030

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROYCE. 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 in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3924, which authorizes the U.S. Global Development Lab within the U.S. Agency for International Development. Through the Lab, USAID workers, with the private sector, partner up; and they tap into the science and technology needed to source and to test proven, low-cost, high-impact solutions to pressing development challenges around the world.

From maternal health to food security, the innovations supported by the Lab are changing the way we think about and the way we deliver foreign aid. This bill provides important authorities to improve the Lab's efficacy and efficiency, and it approves incentive awards through a competitive pay-for-performance process.

It enables the Lab to bring in technical experts on a short-term basis without long-term salary and benefit obligations. When one of these new technologies becomes successful, it allows USAID to keep a portion of its initial investment so the Lab can become financially self-sustaining.

Mr. Speaker, this is the approach that will bend the development curve. This is effective foreign aid.

I want to thank Representative CASTRO and Representative MCCAUL for introducing this very important, bipartisan measure.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this measure. I want to thank Chairman ED ROYCE for bringing this bill forward. I want to also thank Mr. CASTRO of Texas for his leadership and hard work on this measure, and I thank Mr. MCCAUL as well.

Mr. Speaker, around the world, 1.2 billion people live in extreme poverty. That means they live on less than \$1.25 a day. It is hard to imagine. No one should have to live on so little.

At the same time, we know that areas of extreme poverty can be hotbeds for other problems. Poverty leads to broader instability. It creates vulnerabilities that can be exploited by violent extremists, jihadists, or others spreading dangerous ideologies. It holds communities and countries back. So we view alleviating poverty as the right thing to do and also as a strategic concern.

That is why USAID established the Development Lab to help develop and deploy poverty reduction technologies more widely and at a lower cost.

I want to acknowledge former USAID Administrator Rajiv Shah, who did tremendous work at USAID helping build the Lab into a world-class center of innovation, working toward new solutions to extreme poverty.

The Lab works with NGOs, corporations, and universities to bring in the best ideas and stay on the cutting edge of development. It is also expanding USAID's impact through a public-private dollar-for-dollar matching program that allows us to scale these innovations up without expanding USAID's budget.

We are seeing real results. In 2014, the Lab invested in 362 new solutions that touch nearly 14 million people around the world. For example, the Lab funded an initiative aimed at producing more food where fresh water is hard to come by.

Securing Water for Food: A Grand Challenge for Development led to a system that makes seawater or brackish water usable for drinking or agriculture. It consumes so little energy that the cost to use it is low, even in areas off the power grid. This is what we mean when we talk about innovation.

Last May, the Development Lab hosted an international competition to develop technology to fight wildlife trafficking and crimes. I know that Chairman ROYCE has been very interested in this issue. This led to the development of an app called the Wildlife Scan that allows law enforcement to easily identify endangered species being smuggled out of countries. After just a couple of months, the app has already been downloaded more than 1,000 times.

And just last month, the Global Lab finished up a Zika challenge initiative, which led to 21 new solutions targeted at combating the spread of the Zika virus and are on track to be tested and deployed. They could be available within months.

The bill would build on the Lab's success by creating new authorities for the Lab to expand and manage its partnerships. It will give the Lab greater flexibility for hiring experts on a project-by-project basis, and it will allow the Lab to award small, targeted grants that have proven so effective in supporting healthcare providers.

I commend Mr. CASTRO for his hard work on this very good bill. It makes a good initiative better, and I am pleased to support it.

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

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CASTRO), a very valuable member of the Foreign Affairs Committee and the author of this measure.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank Ranking Member ENGEL for yielding me this time and for his support of this legislation. He, Chairman ROYCE, as well as their staff members have been terrific partners in moving this bill forward.

I also want to say a big thank you to my fellow Texan, Representative MIKE MCCAUL, for being the lead Republican cosponsor of this legislation, which aims to make our foreign aid efforts more impactful and cost-efficient.

Created in 2014 through the streamlining and merging of two offices, USAID's Global Development Lab is spearheading a new approach that supports the invention, testing, and utilization of more cost-efficient solutions to development challenges.

The Lab collaborates with entrepreneurs, corporations, NGOs, universities, and science and research institutions to solve some of the world's most difficult development challenges faster, more cheaply, and more sustainably.

Essentially, the Lab democratizes problem solving by crowdsourcing ideas and applications to find the best solutions from around the world. For example, the Lab has used what it calls Grand Challenges for Development to incentivize problem solvers to develop solutions for specific problems.

The Saving Lives at Birth Grand Challenge led to the creation of the Pratt Pouch, a small ketchup packet-like pouch filled with medication that women can use in rural areas to prevent birth-related HIV infections. Other Grand Challenges have led to the development of breakthrough products that keep healthcare workers treating Ebola patients safe, desalinate water in an environmentally sustainable manner, and bring electricity to folks living off the electrical grid in Africa.

The Lab also partners with outside entities, such as universities, to cultivate solutions to specific development challenges ranging from health and food insecurity to chronic conflict. Participating institutions equally match USAID's funding and leverage additional resources from private foundations.

The legislation before us today formally authorizes the U.S. Global Development Lab within USAID and provides new legislative authorities to augment the Lab's current capabilities, allowing the initiative to achieve greater results and maximize its impact.

The bill allows the Lab to use a pay-for-success model and tap into good ideas, no matter their source; bring in term-limited technical experts in a more cost-effective manner; and gain the flexibility to use program income more effectively.

In conclusion, Congress can be proud of the work that the Lab is currently doing and will continue to pursue once we authorize it and provide proper oversight.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Mr. CASTRO and Mr. MCCAUL for their innovation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time now to close.

Let me just say, in recent years, it has become very clear the way issues like global poverty fit into our broader national and international concerns. We see the links between poverty, health, stability, and security. So when we work to relieve this burden and lift up communities, we are also advancing a wide range of interests. As I like to say, it is the smart thing to do, and it is also the right thing to do.

The administration has already taken steps to incorporate poverty alleviation into our development efforts. This bill will help USAID do even more.

So, once again, I want to thank Mr. CASTRO for his hard work. I am glad to support this bill. I thank Chairman ROYCE for his help. I urge all of my colleagues to support this bill.

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

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3924, 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.

VOTING RIGHTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentlewoman from Alabama (Ms. SEWELL) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days

in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the subject of my Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to discuss the importance of voting rights for all Americans across this country.

With less than 50 days before Americans go to the polls to elect our next President and other elected officials, we are still faced with the harsh reality that this will be the first election in 50 years where Americans will not have the full protections of the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

Today's Special Order hour is on behalf of the House Democratic Outreach and Engagement Task Force. I want to thank Assistant Leader CLYBURN for his leadership on the task force and all of the members of the task force as we work together to make sure that we engage all Americans on the importance of voting. In fact, one of the first things the task force did was to host a series of voting rights forums across this Nation to put together a report that shows modern-day barriers to voting still exist.

The Voting Rights Act of 1965 was passed not only by legislation but, Mr. Speaker, the Voting Rights Act of 1965 was passed with the blood, sweat, and tears of so many Americans. In fact, all of us know of the courageous sacrifices of our very own JOHN LEWIS, but there were so many known and unknown foot soldiers that made it possible for America to live up to its ideals of democracy and justice for all.

As a daughter of Selma, Alabama, I am painfully aware that the injustices suffered on the Edmund Pettus Bridge 50 years ago have not been fully vindicated.

Although we no longer are required to count how many marbles are in a jar or recite how many counties there are in the State of Alabama, my proposition to you, Mr. Speaker, is that modern-day barriers to voting still exist. Those barriers may not be as overt as they were 50 years ago, but, Mr. Speaker, they are no less stained. They are no less important as those other barriers were.

I have seen example after example, as the Representative of Alabama's Seventh Congressional District, of the modern-day barriers that exist to voting.

Since the Supreme Court struck down critical parts of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 in the Shelby County v. Holder decision, so many Members have taken to the floor—mostly Democrats—day after day, week after week, month after month, year after year, urging our Republican colleagues to work with us to restore the essential protections of the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

Several of my Democratic colleagues, including myself, have hosted voting

rights forums across this country to highlight the continued need for restoring the Voting Rights Act. Members have also introduced legislation. I, for one, am quite proud of the Voting Rights Advancement Act, a bill that I sponsored, along with several other Members of the House, including Representative LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ and Representative JUDY CHU. Our bill, H.R. 2867, has over 187 cosponsors, Mr. Speaker.

□ 2045

It actually answers the Supreme Court's challenge to come up with a modern-day formula by which to have preclearance provisions in the Voting Rights Act.

I think it is so important, Mr. Speaker, and I know that so many will agree, that we make sure that we find these pernicious examples of restraining people's rights to vote on the front end because, after all, Mr. Speaker, once the elections have happened, you can't unring that bell.

So the beauty of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 was that it allowed preemptive efforts to stop discrimination in voting. Therefore, any changes in voting practices in the covered States had to be precleared by the Justice Department or by the D.C. Court of Appeals. This was quite important.

I have to tell you that what the Shelby decision did was it struck down that key provision, section 4, which gave the covered States and provided the formula by which we know which States would be covered. Therefore, in the Shelby decision, the Supreme Court really issued a challenge to Congress to come up with a modern-day formula.

It was the Supreme Court who said that we can't punish States like Alabama, the State from which I hail, and other southern States, for what happened 50 years ago. Congress must come up with a modern-day formula that talks about current efforts to restrict the right to vote.

Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what we have done in the Voting Rights Advancement Act of 2015. I want you to know that, of the 187 sponsors we currently have, not one Republican has signed on.

Mr. Speaker, this is a sad day in the House of Representatives when voting rights becomes a partisan issue. Voting rights is an American issue. It is neither red nor blue but, rather, it is what our founding fathers fought for, drafted, and ensured that all Americans have a right, a fundamental right, to exercise that right to vote. After all, the integrity of our democracy depends upon every eligible voter being able to vote.

Most recently, I was privileged to also join with my colleagues and my fellow House Members, Representative MARK VEASEY of Texas and Representative BOBBY SCOTT of Virginia, and other Members of Congress, to launch the Congressional Voting Rights Caucus. The Caucus is committed to restoring the Voting Rights Act of 1965 to

its original state and restoring the vote to all suppressed voices in this Nation.

I want to commend my fellow colleagues, Representatives VEASEY and SCOTT, for their visionary leadership in starting this Caucus. I am honored to be a co-chair of the Congressional Voting Rights Caucus, and we will take as our charge to make sure that we fully restore all of the protections of the 1965 Voting Rights Act.

In spite of these continued efforts, Mr. Speaker, it is disheartening to see that State after State, including my own State, after the Shelby decision, instituted photo ID laws, voter-restrictive photo ID laws.

So many of my colleagues, they say: Well, what is so restrictive about requiring a photo ID? After all, you need a photo ID in order to get on a plane or to get your passport.

But I say to all of my colleagues who question the restrictive nature of photo IDs that not all Americans fly, not all Americans have a passport, but all Americans who are eligible have the fundamental right to vote. And we, the elected Representatives on behalf of these Americans, must not impede that most fundamental right.

We should be looking at ways that we can encourage voting not discourage voting. After all, the fundamental foundation of our democracy is the right to vote.

So I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that it is quite important that we, in this House, do what so many of our predecessors have done and restore full protections on the right to vote.

I wish I were alive when Lyndon Johnson signed the voting rights into law. But I can tell you that there were no more fundamental seminal pieces of legislation that passed this omniscient House than the right to vote. The Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965 are still some of the most seminal pieces of legislation that this body has ever passed.

And I say to you, Mr. Speaker: How can we, today, 50 years since the passage—53 years, to be exact—how can we stand on the cusp of electing another President and, for the first time in those 50 years, not have the full protections of the Voting Rights Act?

It is, indeed, a sad day. But I know that this body will and should do the people's work. And the people's work is to allow all Americans who qualify, who have registered to vote, who turned 18—these Americans have the right to vote.

I would love it if this body would pass an automatic voter registration bill. I have signed on to such a bill. But those bills don't get a hearing in the Judiciary Committee, and I am not sure why, Mr. Speaker, because nothing is more fundamental than to have every American, when they reach that certain age of 18, and they go and get their driver's license, be automatically registered to vote.

We are not talking about protecting one class of voters against another

class of voters. We are talking about protecting that fundamental right to vote for all Americans. Nothing seems more American and democratic than that.

The sad reality is that old battles have become new again, and so many States have now really taken the Shelby decision and allowed themselves to put up restrictive laws. We are reminded that they are restrictive laws by the judicial system.

Most recently, the Fourth Circuit overturned the North Carolina photo ID law, in which they said, point blank, that they were targeting—that that voter ID law targeted and discriminated against African American voters. They said that it did so with precision, Mr. Speaker.

There is a fallacy that goes around that says that there is voter fraud rampant in America. Well, I want you to know, Mr. Speaker, that voter fraud does not exist in the volumes by which Americans think they do. A very recent poll by The Washington Post-ABC came out and said that over 50 percent of Americans believe that there is voter fraud.

Well, I will have you know, Mr. Speaker, that study after study, including that by the Brennan Center, have shown that there are very few cases of voter fraud. In fact, their study, between the years of 2000 and 2014, a 14-year period, only showed 31 cases of voter impersonation. And I want you to know that many of those were, in fact, errors, errors in folks' names, when the III or the Junior of a person's name was confused with the Senior of that same name.

Mr. Speaker, the reality is that voter fraud is not rampant, so I am not really sure why States like Alabama have instituted these photo ID laws. My State not only instituted a photo ID law but, last summer, my State, due to "budgetary reasons," closed down more than 31 DMVs, mostly in areas that were disproportionately African American.

So I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, if photo IDs are required, and the most popular form of the photo ID is a driver's license, how can that very State also close down opportunities, foreclosing opportunities for those citizens of that State to get a photo ID?

My State also says that that photo ID is free. Well, I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that they may say it is free and, in fact, it is free if you can come along on those rare days in which the mobile goes through your city.

But I want you to know that many of my constituents, many of whom were born in rural Alabama, many of whom were born over 80 years ago by midwife, those constituents don't have birth certificates. And those that do, well, in order to acquire a birth certificate, that costs money. You have to still be able to produce a birth certificate in order to get this "free" ID from the State of Alabama. So I submit to you that it is not free. I also submit to you

that it is unfair that we put up such barriers.

I am humbled every year by the pilgrimage that JOHN LEWIS takes with many of the Members of Congress in this body. Every year, for the past 18 years, he has taken a pilgrimage through my district. He goes back in time and allows those Members who travel with him to actually retrace his footsteps 50-plus years ago. We go to Birmingham, we go to Montgomery, and we end up, on that Sunday, reenacting Bloody Sunday, that moment in history, that seminal moment in history, in which he was bludgeoned on Edmund Pettus Bridge for the simple right to vote.

And I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that it does not go unnoticed by me, as I drive across the Edmund Pettus Bridge each time I go home to Selma to visit my parents, the sacrifices that ordinary Americans did in order to achieve what ultimately was an extraordinary feat.

When you think of the fact that a young JOHN LEWIS, who was in college at the time, and so many who were out there marching for the right to vote were children, and when you think about the fact that ordinary Americans, collectively working together, achieved this extraordinary feat, it makes you realize how fragile the right to vote really is.

I don't know how any of us can join hands with JOHN LEWIS and walk across the Edmund Pettus Bridge and not understand how important it is to rededicate ourselves to the fight that he once led. We, as elected Representatives of this great Nation, owe it to our own constituents to make sure that every eligible American has the right to vote.

I have to tell you that one of the most moving opportunities for me, as a Member of Congress, was in 2015, when I got a chance to be in my hometown and to welcome over 100 Members of Congress, Republicans and Democrats, two Presidents, Barack Obama and George W. Bush, to my hometown. It was to celebrate America's promise, a promise that became reality through the sacrifice, blood, sweat, and tears of average Americans.

We all came on that beautiful day, March 7, 2015. It was glorious, but it was a kumbaya moment in time. We owe more to the sacrifices of those foot soldiers like JOHN LEWIS than a gold medal. Although, I was proud to put forth that bill, and even prouder to be able to bestow the gold medal to those foot soldiers that did march in the Selma-to-Montgomery March. It was a great day.

But, Mr. Speaker, we came back to this body, to this House of Representatives, and we did absolutely nothing to restore the Voting Rights Act of 1965. There have been several bills that have come forth. There has been the Voting Rights Amendment Act that had bipartisan support, both from Congressman CONYERS and from Congressman SEN-SENBRENNER of Wisconsin. That bill didn't get more than 30 cosponsors.

Then, of course, there is my bill, the Voting Rights Advancement Act of 2015, which has over 187 sponsors.

We have to meet in the middle, Mr. Speaker, because voting rights are so essential. And on this, less than 50 days before we have a Presidential election, it is simply unacceptable that we go without the full protections of the Voting Rights Act.

What do I mean by that? What is at stake really by not having those full protections?

Well, we witnessed, in the primary in Arizona in Maricopa County—this was a county that was covered by the Voting Rights Act of 1965, but, because of the Shelby decision, there was no more preclearance. And so, this county in Arizona went from a height of 400 polling stations down—that was in 2012—down to 60 polling stations in 2016.

There were long lines, Mr. Speaker, in Maricopa County. People had to wait hours for the right to vote.

I would venture to guess, had the Shelby decision not occurred, and we had the full protections of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, that there would be no way that Maricopa County, Arizona, would have been able to change those polling stations and reduce the number of the polling stations to 60 from 400 had there been preclearance.

□ 2100

So what is at stake really is the integrity of our democracy. What is at stake is the fact that we in America should not have to wait hours to vote. We in America should not have to produce documents that we do not have to vote. I think it is ironic that in many of these States you can present a gun permit license with a photo and be able to vote, but you can't produce a student ID from a State university and vote.

I believe that what is at stake right now is the integrity of our democracy, and that all of us should be outraged if even one person is denied the right to vote. This is a very important, very important issue that I, again, submit to you is neither Republican nor Democrat. It is truly bipartisan, and that is the right to vote.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. VEASEY), my colleague.

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman, Congresswoman SEWELL, for organizing this very important Special Order hour today to talk about something that is really timely, especially with elections coming up. I want to be able to stand here today with my colleagues to bring awareness to the injustice—the injustices really—that are oppressing the most vulnerable members of our democracy.

I want to start with some history from the 1960s, and then some more recent history. As you know, in 1965, the Voting Rights Act sought to ensure that voters would never again face intimidation or unnecessary obstacles in exercising their right to vote as Amer-

ican citizens. But in 2013, *Shelby County v. Holder* gutted the 1965 Voting Rights Act and set in motion what many feared: the subjection of minorities, seniors, and low-income Americans to unfair, punitive barriers that make it hard for them to vote—make it hard for people to exercise their very basic right as an American citizen.

As a native of Texas representing the Dallas and Fort Worth area, I have seen firsthand the effects of these suppressive laws that have been put in place in 33 States since the Supreme Court issued in *Shelby County v. Holder*. Some of the tactics in Texas that were used—and you heard Representative SEWELL talk about it a little bit earlier. If you have a license—a school ID from Texas A&M University or the University of Texas or Prairie View A&M or Texas Southern University, any of our State universities, these are the same IDs that students can use. Let's say they are on campus and they are doing something they are not supposed to do, they can use those IDs to identify themselves to law enforcement authorities on the campuses there; but if they were to try to come home and use that ID, they would be denied the right to vote. But, again, if you are the owner of a handgun and you have a concealed handgun license, you can use that particular ID to vote. It is almost unfair. You can see how everything is stacked against the everyday voters.

With the requirement that a photo ID be used to vote, some individuals without an ID had to travel great distances to get them or struggled to pay for the supporting documents they needed in order to get the ID to vote. You heard Representative SEWELL talk about that a little bit earlier.

Let me give you an example of that. In Texas we have 254 counties. Everybody knows that Texas is a big State. Some of those counties don't even have driver's license centers or ID centers where people can get their voter ID cards or their driver's license or their State ID or the other documentation that is needed to be able to vote. So that is why I got involved as the lead plaintiff in *Veasey v. Abbott*, which was the voter ID case, to overturn the law.

Our case has been heard before three—literally three—Federal courts, including what is considered the most conservative appellate court in the entire country, which is the Fifth Circuit. In July 2016, the full Fifth Circuit ruled in favor of Texas voters. That ought to tell you something that the Fifth Circuit was even like, hey, this thing has some real, real problems.

That same month, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit struck down North Carolina's restrictive voting laws, and the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Wisconsin invalidated portions of their voting law there that was designed to prevent individuals from casting their right to vote.

The courts have found what we have always known to be true, and that is

that these restrictive voter ID laws intentionally discriminate against minority voters and disenfranchise eligible American voters.

These victories are a few of the major victories, but we have also had victories in non-Southern States. It is mentioned that it is the Southern States where a lot of these issues have historically been a problem, but we know that even outside of the South there have been issues—Ohio, Kansas, and Michigan—and so far the courts continue to rule in the favor of the voter. I hope they will continue to do so in the future.

But while we see these victories, we also continue to face challenges. Some of you recently have heard that Judge Ramos in the Texas case, who issued the interim voting rules in the Texas case, had to actually order the attorney general, the Governor, and the secretary of state to stop sending out misleading and confusing election materials to try to confuse people about the voter ID ruling.

That worries me a lot because what is that saying is going to happen to this upcoming election in November in 2016? Are we getting a sneak preview of some of the dirty tricks that may take place around the country?

The fact that a Federal judge issued these guidelines and State officials tried to send out misleading information from a Federal judge is scary. Those are dirty tricks that we have to watch out for in this November 2016 election.

We know that the attorney general, because he said so, is going to appeal this case to the Supreme Court. But until we see an end to barriers to voting and the distribution of misinformation to discourage eligible citizens from casting their ballots, we will not stop fighting. Every day, my colleagues and I, led by the Democratic Outreach and Engagement Task Force and the Congressional Voting Rights Caucus, will continue to fight to have these suppressive laws invalidated. Even in the face of lengthy court battles, we welcome the challenge because it means we have to protect the right to vote.

One of the things that I did to continue to shed light on this issue is I actually introduced a resolution last week to designate September as National Voting Rights Month. This year, Americans will cast their ballots in one of the most important general elections that this country has ever seen. The designation of September as National Voting Rights Month will serve to assist in spreading information and awareness about voter registration dates and voting dates, early voting, polling place locations, how to maintain voter rolls, and some of the suppressive tactics that are being used. We want to inform people about that as well because it would be an affront, Representative SEWELL, to our predecessors to allow suppressive tactics to deny Americans the right that many have fought and died for.

That is why Congress must continue to lead the charge in restoring the right for all Americans to vote by fixing the Voting Rights Act and by encouraging participation in, again, what is our most sacred right as Americans, and that is the right to vote.

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative VEASEY for his tireless effort not only as a plaintiff in the Texas case courageously fighting against the injustices against voters, but I want to also thank the gentleman for his leadership on the Congressional Voting Rights Caucus and for his participation in tonight's Special Order hour. We are all with the gentleman in his efforts to make sure that all Americans have the right to vote.

Mr. Speaker, I have said that I introduced a bill called the Voting Rights Advancement Act. I would like to talk a little bit about the Voting Rights Advancement Act of 2015 in an effort to really encourage the rest of my colleagues here in this august body to join with me in passing the Voting Rights Advancement Act.

What the Voting Rights Advancement Act does is it provides a modern-day formula, exactly what the Supreme Court asked of Congress. By striking down the old formula in the Shelby decision, the Supreme Court issued a challenge to Congress to come up with a modern-day formula. That is exactly what we do in this bill. This bill doesn't look back to 1940, 1950 or 1960. Oh, no. This bill looks at 1990 going forward. It is a 25-year lookback. If a State has had five or more statewide violations, then it will be a covered State. So it is a modern-day formula looking at any incidents of discriminatory practices since 1990 going forward.

Mr. Speaker, you should not be surprised that even in looking at modern-day barriers or instituting this modern-day formula that you would still have 13 States that have had five or more statewide violations in the last 26 years. Those States include Alabama, Georgia, Mississippi, Texas, Louisiana, Florida, South Carolina, North Carolina, Arizona, California, New York, and Virginia. Yes, Mr. Speaker, it includes Arizona, it includes California and New York, not just Deep South Southern States.

In the last 26 years, these States have had five or more statewide violations of voting rights. I have to tell you that this goes to show you that there is a need for us to have continued full protections of the Voting Rights Act. There is no way, Mr. Speaker, that we can only rely on those lawsuits on section 2 which occur after the election has occurred. We need the efforts to be able to stop the discriminatory practices before they have the discriminatory effect. That is exactly what the Voting Rights Act of 1965 does and what the Voting Rights Advancement Act, H.R. 2867, would do. It would put teeth back into the preclearance provision.

Now, we call it the Voting Rights Advancement Act because it also talks

about discriminatory effects and practices on tribal lands. Back in 1965, we didn't protect tribal lands and the right to vote of those Americans. It is critically important that we modernize the Voting Rights Act of 1965 and make sure that we cover all Americans, including those who live in tribal lands.

The Voting Rights Advancement Act of 2015 would allow Federal courts to immediately halt questionable voting practices until a final ruling is made. This provision would recognize that, when voting rights are at stake, prohibiting a discriminatory practice after the election has concluded is too late to truly protect voter rights.

This bill would also give the Attorney General authority to request that Federal observers be present anywhere in the country where discriminatory voting practices pose a serious threat. This bill would also increase transparency by requiring reasonable public notice for voting changes.

So, Mr. Speaker, if this bill had been in effect during the primary in Arizona, there would be no way that the election officials in Maricopa County, Arizona, would have been able to shrink the size of the number of polling stations—the populations stood the same or grew, and yet they shrunk the number of polling stations from 400 in 2012 to 60 in 2016, in 4 years. There is no way that that would have stood. You cannot tell me that that did not have a discriminatory impact on voters. Those lines being so long, I can't tell you—we will never know how many people got discouraged, how many working mothers or working family parents had to leave the line in order to go pick up their children or be able to provide for their family. We don't know how many people didn't get the chance to vote.

To me, Mr. Speaker, that is exactly the integrity of the democracy that is being questioned by not having the full protections of the Voting Rights Act.

So I ask my colleagues to join me and the 187 other cosponsors of the Voting Rights Advancement Act and let us put teeth back into the Voting Rights Act of 1965 by coming up and approving, passing, this modern-day formula. I believe that a lookback of 1990 going forward is ample evidence of voter discrimination and discriminatory practices and that States that have had five or more statewide violations should be a covered State.

□ 2115

This bill would allow them to be a covered State for 10 years. Now, obviously, during this 10-year period, if the State remedies itself, it can no longer be a covered State. There are ample provisions to allow for States to be opted in and opted out. I think that what, ultimately, we all want is that the full integrity of our democratic process be preserved, and that is exactly what would happen with this Voting Rights Advancement Act.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD witness testimony from the voting

rights townhall hosted by Representatives JEFFRIES, MENG, and VELÁZQUEZ in New York.

[From LatinoJustice]

TESTIMONY OF JUAN CARTAGENA PRESIDENT & GENERAL COUNSEL LATINOJUSTICE PRLDEF ON FRAGILE AT 50: THE URGENT NEED TO STRENGTHEN AND RESTORE THE VOTING RIGHTS ACT

Good morning Congresswoman Velázquez, Congressman Jeffries, and Congresswoman Meng. On behalf of LatinoJustice PRLDEF—formerly known as the Puerto Rican Legal Defense & Education Fund—I respectfully submit this testimony at the forum Fragile at 50: The Urgent Need to Strengthen and Restore the Voting Rights Act.

My testimony will center on the historical significance of Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act in the three formerly covered counties of Bronx, Kings and New York for both general compliance problems and bilingual assistance problems.

THE HISTORICAL CONTEXT

The historical foundations of Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act in New York City—a subject that has been a focus of my previous research and publications, I submit, provides the context for the Act's salience today.

Two important lessons emanate from this history. The first is that New York City was in effect, the laboratory of bilingual voting assistance for language minority citizens in the entire country—and it all started with Puerto Rican voters. The second is that Section 5 arguably had its most direct and prophylactic effects for minority voters as a tool against discriminatory voting schemes beyond redistricting plans. I now turn to those two historical episodes.

Section Five's application to three counties in New York stems directly from the previous application of Section 4(e) of the Voting Act which is colloquially known as the Puerto Rican section of the Act. While the VRA was historically and rightfully aimed at restoring the dignity of the African-American vote, it was never just black and white, not even in 1965. Section 4(e) was championed in a bipartisan manner by Senators Robert Kennedy and Jacob Javits. It drew support from Puerto Rican icons like Herman Badillo, Gilberto Gerena-Valentin and Irma Vidal Santaella who testified in Congress against the notion that one can only be a productive and effective voter in New York only if literate in English. Their testimony led to Section 4(e) which outlawed any English-only literacy test that would deny voter registration to any Puerto Rican who achieved at least a 6th grade education in Puerto Rico's schools. The remedy was bilingual voter registration and bilingual ballot access. The litigation spawned by this law—all of it filed by the Puerto Rican Legal Defense & Education Fund—set the stage for major court decisions declaring that English-only election systems deprived citizens of a meaningful right to vote and were discriminatory under the VRA. Those decisions, especially *Torres v. Sachs*, were used by the NAACP to argue that Section 5 coverage of New York City—previously certified but exempted by a separate court at the State's urging—should be reinstated. That argument prevailed and Section 5 became a reality directly because of the discrimination against Puerto Rican voters.

The impact of Section 4(e) did not stop there, however. During the 1975 congressional deliberations to create bilingual assistance provisions of the Act to cover all Spanish-language, Asian language and Native American language voters the House clearly recognized that bilingual voting structures were both viable and effective.

They cited New York City as the example that bilingual voting could not be deemed radical as it had been in place for a decade under Section 4(e). In sum, Puerto Rican voters challenged the discriminatory nature of English only systems and won, to their benefit and the benefit of all other language minority citizens nationwide.

The second major lesson of Section 5 coverage in New York City stems from its powerful effect of stemming discriminatory practices beyond redistricting plans. Redistricting, continued to be at the heart of the importance of the VRA in New York. In 1981 the councilmanic redistricting plan was passed but never precleared as required by law. This led to multiple suits by black and Latino voters that resulted in suspending the entire citywide primary elections just two days before the September election day. This victory put teeth into Section 5 and forced the City to justify the fact that they refused to create additional black and Latino council districts despite major demographic change. Weeks later the Department of Justice interposed an objection under Section 5 and the map was redrawn clearing the way for the eventual majority of black, Asian American and Latino council men and women in this decade. From 1982 through 2006—the year Section 5 was reauthorized by an overwhelming bipartisan vote in Congress—additional objections were interposed by the Department of Justice to discriminatory redistricting plans including a 1991 objection to the NYC City Council plan and a 1992 objection to the NYS Assembly plan.

Section 5 objections also addressed other practices beyond redistricting including switching the form of voting of community school board members in 1999; replacing elected school board members with appointed trustees in 1996; the creation of additional judgeships for state courts in 1994; failure to accurately translate names and instructions in the Chinese language in 1994; and failure to provide appropriate language assistance to Chinese voters in 1993.

VRA compliance activity was not limited to Section 5 actual objections in the decades in which the City was covered. The Department of Justice continuously deployed Federal Observers to monitor the City for language assistance compliance for both Spanish and Asian languages. Indeed, from 1985 to 2004 alone 881 Federal Observers were dispatched to ensure compliance with the VRA. Moreover, Section 5 had a strong prophylactic effect in the City as measured by the impact of More Information Request letters issued by the Department of Justice to the City. These letters often stemmed discriminatory practices when the City withdrew its request for preclearance upon receiving the More Information Request letter—a regular occurrence throughout other Section 5 covered jurisdictions. One study by Luis Fraga and Maria Ocampo found that in the City alone from 1990 to 2005 113 letters were issued and 53 resulted in the equivalent of interposing an objection.

THE EFFECTS OF A RENEWED VRA TODAY

It is clear that the recent episodes of purging voters in Brooklyn and mis-deployment of Spanish language interpreters in the Congressional Democratic primaries in Congressman RANGEL's district in Washington Heights would have been ameliorated if not completely avoided had Section Five been in effect after the Shelby County decision. The historical context described above demonstrates that these episodes of potentially discriminatory practices would have been addressed by the power of Section Five. Accordingly, its absence is sorely felt in the City.

I end, however, with an example of the power of Section 5 in New York City in 2014

just months after the Supreme Court's decision in Shelby County v. Holder earlier that year in June. The scene is a press conference in September 2014 on the steps of City Hall after the New York City Council voted to pass the Community Safety Act after then Mayor Bloomberg had vetoed the measure weeks before. Speaker Quinn was not in favor of the bill and noted her reservations. After considerable pressure from the minority members of the Council she allowed the bill to come to a vote. The legislation was intended to address some of the worst features of the notorious Stop & Frisk practices of the New York Police Department that by the end of the Bloomberg administration skyrocketed to over 4 million stops, predominantly directed at black and Latino residents of the City with such a level of ineffectiveness that minimally 86% of those stopped were never charged with a crime or violation. The Mayor and Police Commissioner Raymond Kelley insisted on preserving the practice going so far as painting a doomsday scenario or rampant violent crime if the practice were curbed. References to retrogressing to the Dinkins' administration—another example of Dog Whistle Politics—were all over the tabloids. The black and Latino members of the Council knew better. They listened to the voices of the victims of this abuse, they spearheaded hearings on the matter, they debated the efficacy and unjustness of the practice in the tabloids. In short they were being responsive to the needs of black, Latino and Asian-American voters.

The Council voted that day to overcome the mayor's veto and enact that portion of the Community Safety Act. It was the first time in New York City history that the Council overcame a mayoral veto! The historical significance of the vote was not lost on me as I commented to the press how critical that vote became on a quintessential minority issue because it was directly attributed to the strength of Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act. It was Section 5 that permitted council districts to be drawn to fully reflect black, Latino and Asian American voting strength going back to the 1980s when Section 5 was used to stop a discriminatory councilmanic redistricting plan. And it was Section 5 that preserved that minority voting strength in all subsequent decennial redistricting plans. Shelby County v. Holder may have taken that tool away but its importance was nonetheless evident months later.

I respectfully submit, that this is why Congress must restore this aspect of the Voting Rights Act.

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, as I close out this Special Order on voting rights, I would be remiss if I didn't say that, as a daughter of Selma, I can think of no more noble thing for me to fight for than voting rights and the full restoration of those voting rights. After all, it was because of the blood, sweat, and tears in my district and in my hometown that we have so many elected officials that are of color.

It is no small wonder why we are seeing such efforts to go out and make sure that people don't have a right to vote when elected officials say in their remarks as they are introducing legislation for restrictive voting photo IDs, make comments like, "Well, the people that we are restricting will only be Democratic voters." That just suggests to me that the reason why these restrictive voting photo ID laws were being promulgated was to do exactly

that—suppress certain groups of voters. That is absolutely unacceptable and un-American.

I could also tell you that one of the greatest moments for me on this House floor was when I had an opportunity to escort, as my State of the Union guest in 2015, Miss Amelia Boynton Robinson, who was 104 when she came to the State of the Union in 2015.

You see, Miss Amelia Boynton Robinson, on Bloody Sunday in 1965, was bludgeoned on the Edmund Pettus Bridge, along with Congressman JOHN LEWIS. But at 104 years old, she was so excited to come to this august body and to hear President Barack Obama's State of the Union Address. She was excited not because she would get an opportunity to meet the first African American President, but she was excited because she got a chance to see this elected body at work.

She told me that one of her proudest moments was not only casting a ballot, but she told me that one of her proudest moments was to be the first African American woman to be on the ballot in the State of Alabama running for Congress. She ran, Mr. Speaker, for this seat, the Seventh Congressional seat that I am so fortunate to have. She ran for that seat in 1964.

So when I think about Miss Amelia Boynton, I not only think about Bloody Sunday and her sacrifice on that bridge, but I also think about her courage, the courage of this African American woman to have the audacity to think that she could be a Member of Congress from the great State of Alabama in 1964.

I know I get to walk these hallowed Halls and I get to stand here today and speak with you, Mr. Speaker, because of her courage and her sacrifice. It is not lost on me that she is looking down now wondering what that sacrifice truly meant to America, that we could 50 years later have a Court case that totally dismantled the full protections of the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

Now, when Miss Amelia Boynton Robinson came to the State of the Union, we had an opportunity to meet and talk with President Barack Obama before his speech. I will never forget being in the holding room, if you will, behind this Chamber. As many of the members of his Cabinet would come into the room, they would say the same thing: "Miss Boynton, we stand on your shoulders." "Miss Boynton, we are so glad that you made those sacrifices on that bridge because we get to do what we do now because you made those sacrifices. We stand on your shoulders."

I can tell you that person after person—Secretary of State, Secretary of Transportation, Secretary of HUD—they were all saying the same thing. By the time the Attorney General came up to her and said, "Miss Boynton, I stand on your shoulders," she looked up at him and said, "Get off my shoulders. Do your own work." Yes, Mr. Speaker, at 104 years old, she had

the temerity to say, “Do your own work.”

It is not enough that we stand on the shoulders of giants like Amelia Boynton Robinson and JOHN LEWIS; we have to do our own work. And so I say to this body that we can do our own work by protecting that sacred right to work, and that we should do our own work, as we dedicate ourselves to the proposition that these average, ordinary Americans had the nerve, the audacity to fight for. If they could fight for it over 50 years ago, we can fight for it today.

I am grateful to have the opportunity to lead the Special Order hour on voting rights not only as a native of Selma, Alabama, but as a very proud, proud beneficiary of the strength and power of the right to vote and of their sacrifices.

I say in closing, I hope that my fellow colleagues will join us by signing on to H.R. 2867, the Voting Rights Advancement Act. I urge all of my colleagues to do so. It is in some way, some small way, with a huge impact potentially, that we can ensure that this great democracy lives on. After all, if one American is denied access to the ballot box, it does, in fact, go to the integrity of all of the election process.

So much is at stake not only in this Presidential election, but in every election, because in every election, Americans use their vote as their voice. So when you don't have a vote, you don't have a voice in this great democracy. No vote, no voice; we should remember that as elected officials.

As we grapple with the opportunity that we have to come up with a modern-day formula, I would be willing to sit with any of my Republican colleagues to come up with a modern-day formula that would work in both Houses and by both parties. I think it is critically important that we do this work. I think that there is no greater work that we could be doing than to restore the full protections of the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

I am also reminded of what Mrs. Boynton said when she finally did meet the President. It was quite a moment for all of us who were present when she finally walked into that small holding room, and he knelt beside her and he took her hand and he said, “Mrs. Boynton, I don't know how to say thank you enough. I get to give a speech as a President of the United States in a few minutes, and it is because of your sacrifice.” And Mrs. Boynton, at 104, without missing a beat, looked up at our President and said, “Make it a good one.” Yes, she said, “Make this speech a good one.” Why? Because of the sacrifices that she and so many brave Americans had on that bridge.

We, as Americans, who are beneficiaries of that amazing legacy, owe it to them to make every day a good one, to make everything we do good because people sacrificed for us to have the rights that we have. So I remember

“Make it a good one,” and I say to my colleagues, let us make it a good one right here in this august body by passing the Voting Rights Advancement Act of 2015 and fully restoring the voting rights protections of all Americans.

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

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, this November, voters across our country are faced with the likely prospect of heading to the polls without the full protections of the Voting Rights Act.

Signed into law in 1965 by President Lyndon Johnson, the Voting Rights Act broke down state and local laws that kept minorities from exercising their constitutional right to vote.

That fundamental right of our democracy was severely undermined by the 2013 Supreme Court decision in *Shelby County vs. Holder*.

That misguided decision gutted Section 5, the heart of the Voting Rights Act, which barred states and localities with a history of discriminatory policies from implementing new voting changes without the approval of the Department of Justice.

Based on the Supreme Court ruling, states are now free to pass and enforce laws that create obstacles to voting.

That is exactly what many states are doing: in fact in the 2014 mid-term election and in this year's presidential primaries numerous voters were denied the ability to participate in our democratic process.

A report from the NALEO Educational Fund, estimates these restrictive voting changes, could result in more than 875,000 eligible Latinos finding it more difficult to vote this year than in 2012.

In other words, without the protections of The Voting Rights Act this presidential election will be the first in over 50 years in which American voters of color will be faced with new and renewed obstacles to voting. According to the Brennan Center for Justice, 14 states will have new voting restrictions in place for this year's presidential election. These new laws include strict photo ID requirements, cutbacks to early voting, and new registration restrictions.

To help our constituents gain a better understanding of the negative impact of the Supreme Court decision, this past May, like many of my colleagues, I hosted a forum titled “Protect Your Future: Restore the Vote.” My co-chairs were Representative LINDA SANCHEZ, Chair of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus; Representative JUDY CHU, Chair of the Asian Pacific American Caucus; and special guest, Representative KAREN BASS.

Members from our communities heard expert testimony from the NAACP, the Mexican American Legal Defense Fund, Asian Americans Advancing Justice and NALEO.

Panelists gave examples of the concerted assault on minorities at the ballot box and testified to the undeniable value of Congress restoring the pre-clearance provisions of Section 5 by passing H.R. 2867, the Voting Rights Advancement Act.

I thank our panelists for sharing their expertise and will submit their testimony into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD today.

On a positive note, as we rapidly approach the 2016 presidential election, critical victories are being won as courts continue to strike down racist and discriminatory voting laws.

In July of this year, the Texas U.S. Court of Appeals for the 5th Circuit, found that the state's voter ID law discriminated against African-American and Latino voters. Days later, judges of the 4th U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals in North Carolina found that North Carolina state law targeted black voters, and I quote, “with almost surgical precision.”

While these are important victories it is nevertheless a tragedy to our Democracy that so much time and money has been spent for American voters to win back a right already granted to them under the Constitution of the United States.

The ability to vote is not a Democratic or Republican right. It is an American right and the cornerstone of our democracy.

Today, I join my colleagues in urging the Republican leadership to join Democrats to live up to their Constitutional responsibility to protect every American's right to vote by passing H.R. 2867, the Voting Rights Advancement Act.

The ability to vote is one of the most fundamental rights. That right is not a Democratic or Republican right. It is an American right and the cornerstone of our democracy.

I include in the RECORD the following testimony:

TESTIMONY OF STEWART KWOH, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR AND PRESIDENT, ASIAN AMERICANS ADVANCING JUSTICE-LOS ANGELES, MAY 20, 2016

HON. CONGRESSMEMBERS: Thank you for inviting me to this critical subject of voting rights.

My name is Stewart Kwoh, and I am the Executive Director and President of Asian Americans Advancing Justice-Los Angeles. We are the largest civil rights organization in the nation dedicated to issues affecting the Asian American, Native Hawaiian, and Pacific Islander (AANHPI) communities. As a civil rights organization, we have a voting rights project working to ensure that systems and policies do not dilute the AANHPI votes and that language assistance is provided under federal and state laws. We are part of a national affiliation with offices in Los Angeles, San Francisco, Chicago, Atlanta, and Washington D.C.

On July 18, 2013, our entire affiliation filed a joint statement with Asian Americans Legal Defense and Education Fund before the Subcommittee on the Constitution and Civil Justice Committee on the Judiciary United States House of Representatives at the hearing on “The Voting Rights Act after the Supreme Court's Decision in *Shelby County*.” My plan today is not to repeat our joint statement. Instead, I will first provide a brief overview of what the *Shelby County v. Holder* decision means for Asian Americans nationally. I will then briefly outline issues faced by Asian American voters in California and close with the importance of the Voting Rights Advancement Act.

IMPACT OF SHELBY COUNTY V. HOLDER DECISION

Immediately prior to *Shelby*, there were 15 states that were covered in whole or in part under Section 5 (not including states in which the state or localities terminated coverage through bailout). Over half of these states are among the top 20 states having the largest Asian American populations in the country.

Former Section 5 jurisdictions are also home to the most rapidly growing Asian American populations. From 2000 to 2010, the country's Asian American population grew by 46%, making Asian Americans the fastest-growing racial group in the nation. Notably, in over two-thirds of former Section 5 states,

the Asian American population grew at a more rapid rate than this.

The following list illustrates this point:

California (partial coverage for Kings, Monterey and Yuba Counties)—5.6 million Asian Americans, largest Asian American population by state, 34% growth since 2000

New York (partial coverage for Bronx, Kings and New York Counties)—1.6 million Asian Americans, second-largest Asian American population by state, 35% growth since 2000

Texas (statewide coverage)—1.1 million Asian Americans, third-largest Asian American population by state, 72% growth since 2000

Florida (partial coverage for Collier, Hardee, Hendry, Hillsborough and Monroe Counties)—over 570,000 Asian Americans, eighth-largest Asian American population by state, 72% growth since 2000

Virginia (statewide coverage)—over 520,000 Asian Americans, ninth-largest Asian American population by state, 71% growth since 2000

Georgia (statewide coverage)—over 360,000 Asian Americans, 13th-largest Asian American population by state, 83% growth since 2000

North Carolina (partial coverage for 40 counties)—over 250,000 Asian Americans, 15th-largest Asian American population by state, 85% growth since 2000

Arizona (statewide coverage)—over 230,000 Asian Americans, 19th-largest Asian American population by state, 95% growth since 2000

The termination of Section 5 coverage for these states comes at a pivotal moment for Asian American communities, which in recent years have begun to emerge politically in these states as they increase in size. As our nation has historically witnessed, when groups of racial minorities move into an area, or outpace the general population growth in an area, the result is often racial tension and sometimes racial discrimination, including voting discrimination.

CONTINUING BARRIERS TO VOTING

Asian Americans in California continue to face barriers in the electoral process. While a number of jurisdictions meet their obligations to provide language assistance under Section 203 of the Voting Rights Act in commendable fashion, enforcement actions to bring jurisdictions into compliance have been necessary in some instances. In the past decade, the U.S. Department of Justice brought Section 203 enforcement actions against San Diego County (2004), the City of Rosemead (2005), the City of Walnut (2007), and Alameda County (2011), for non-compliance with respect to Asian language requirements.

In 2013, the Asian Americans Advancing Justice affiliation released a report that examined Asian language assistance in Section 203-covered jurisdictions across the country, including the eight counties in California covered for Asian American populations. Drawing upon poll monitoring carried out at nearly 900 election precincts during the November 2012 election, the report shows that some jurisdictions are making use of good practices to provide written and oral assistance. At the same time, the report found low visibility or no display of translated materials at 45% of poll sites monitored and a lack of bilingual poll workers at nearly a quarter of poll sites monitored.

In the vote dilution context, Asian Americans are confronted with racially polarized voting that impairs their ability to elect candidates of choice, perhaps not in every area of the state where Asian Americans are concentrated, but at least in certain areas of the state. Leading up to the post-2010 Census

redistricting, Asian Americans Advancing Justice-Los Angeles worked with a political scientist to assess the existence of racially polarized voting against Asian Americans in the San Gabriel Valley and South Bay regions of Los Angeles County. In his analysis of 13 elections, the political scientist found that in all elections Asian American voters demonstrated cohesive voting patterns in favor of Asian American candidates. Non-Asian Americans tended to vote against the candidates preferred by Asian American voters; in ten of the elections, non-Asian Americans gave less than 50% of their vote to candidates preferred by Asian Americans.

IMPORTANCE OF THE VOTING RIGHTS ADVANCEMENT ACT

On June 24, 2015, the Voting Rights Advancement Act (Advancement Act) was introduced in the Senate (S. 1659) and the House (H.R. 2867). The Advancement Act has received broad and vocal support from the civil rights community because it responds to the unique, modern-day challenges of voting discrimination that have evolved in the 50 years since the Voting Rights Act first passed. The Advancement Act recognizes that changing demographics require tools that protect voters nationwide—especially voters of color, voters who rely on languages other than English, and voters with disabilities. It also requires that jurisdictions make voting changes public and transparent. The Advancement Act would modernize the preclearance formula to cover states with a pattern of discrimination that puts voters at risk, ensure that last-minute voting changes will not adversely affect voters, protect voters from the types of voting changes most likely to discriminate against people of color and language minorities, enhance the ability to apply preclearance review when needed, and expand the effective Federal Observer program and improve voting rights protections for Native Americans and Alaska Natives.

Since the Shelby decision, 17 states have implemented or adopted new voting restriction laws which are in place for the first time for the 2016 presidential election. Many of these restrictions, such as ID requirements, proof of citizenship, and limitations to early voting, are practices that would require preclearance by the Department of Justice under the Advancement Act. These are known practices which often result in the disenfranchisement of voters, particularly voters of color and low-income voters.

Some of the known practices disproportionately affect naturalized citizens, and in the United States, 63% of Asian Americans who are U.S. citizens and 18 or older are naturalized citizens. Proof of citizenship, in particular, has a disparate impact on naturalized citizens. Unlike birth certificates, naturalization certificates cannot be copied without lawful authority. When Arizona implemented its proof of citizenship requirement (which was later found to violate the National Voter Registration Act), some counties accepted copies of the naturalization certificate, others did not. In the counties that did not, a naturalized citizen without a passport would have to register in person at the election official's office during normal business hours. Moreover, duplicate or replacement copies of the certificate can take over a year and costs \$345 to obtain a copy. For those without the funds to obtain a duplicate copy, the proof of citizenship requirement is a denial of the right to vote. Even for those who are able to afford the fee, many elections can occur during the time it takes to obtain a duplicate. It is, therefore, crucial for the Department of Justice to have the authority to critically review proof of citizenship requirements linked to voting.

Earlier this year, we saw the implementation of North Carolina's new photo ID law. As noted above, North Carolina has the 15th largest Asian American community by state. Rudy Ravindra, a resident of North Carolina, wrote an op-ed for Raleigh's *The News & Observer* recounting his March 2016 early voting experience. According to Mr. Ravindra, after giving his driver's license to the poll worker, the poll worker required Mr. Ravindra to spell his name as he (the poll worker) typed it into the system. Mr. Ravindra reported that his wife had the same experience on election day. In both situations, poll workers simply looked at the white voters' identification cards and did not ask them to spell their names. While the Advancement Act focuses on policies before implementation, the Department of Justice might have blocked North Carolina's ID law in the first place.

Another known practice that would be subject to preclearance by the Advancement Act is changes that reduce, consolidate, or relocate voting locations. In Arizona's March primary, the election official in Maricopa County consolidated precincts into large vote centers but failed to provide enough staff support. Each vote center was assigned 21,000 voters. News coverage reported voters having to wait 4 to 5 hours to vote. As noted above, Arizona saw 95% growth in the Asian American population since 2000, and Maricopa County is home to 82,000 Asian American eligible voters. Oversight by the Department of Justice could have stopped the closure of neighborhood precincts and prevented the disenfranchisement of the voters who could not stand in line for hours.

In the three years since the Shelby decision, Congress has failed to restore the Voting Rights Act, and voters have been disenfranchised due to new laws and practices implemented post-Shelby. While the three Congressmembers holding this roundtable have been champions in advocating for the Voting Rights Advancement Act, the time is now for the full Congress to take up and debate the bill. Congress must come together, as it has each time the Voting Rights Act has been before it, to restore the protections found in the Voting Rights Act to ensure a stronger democracy.

Thank you again for the invitation to testify before you today.

Ms. VELAZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, it's ironic that, as a country, we consistently advocate for other countries to support democratic traditions and institutions—and empower their citizens.

Sadly, because of the Shelby decision, we are not living up to our own standards.

But, we cannot lay all the blame on the Supreme Court. The Court was clear in their ruling. While they invalidated the mechanism used to determine what jurisdictions required preclearance—they also suggested that Congress could come up with a standard that passes constitutional muster.

Sadly, thanks to Republican inaction, we have failed in that task.

Now, we are about to have the first Presidential election—in five decades—without the very basic protections that were enshrined in the Voting Rights Act.

What does this mean? It means that some of our most vulnerable populations—communities of color, young people, students and women—are more likely to encounter obstacles to exercising their most basic right.

And, let's be absolutely clear—there remain serious challenges and problems when it comes to protecting voters. By no means are the protections in the VRA out-of-date or no longer necessary.

We saw a stark example of this earlier this year—in Brooklyn. In April, some 120,000 voters from the rolls in Kings County—the largest county in the state—were improperly purged from the voter rolls.

And, an analysis by local media outlets found those affected were disproportionately Latino voters—mostly in working class neighborhoods like Sunset Park, East New York, and parts of Bushwick and Williamsburg.

Now, let's recall that Kings County was previously covered by Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act. Would these voters have been removed if the VRA were still intact? The fact is we do not know.

But we do know this—our democracy and our system of voting is not perfect—and to argue that voters are no longer disenfranchised is simply false. We've seen that clearly in Brooklyn.

And, let me make one other observation—those who argue that we need more stringent voter ID laws to prevent “voter fraud” are making a dishonest argument. Every credible expert who has examined the data has concluded this—voter fraud is exceedingly rare, if not completely nonexistent.

Voting rights should not be a Republican issue or a Democratic issue. We should all be passionate about defending and upholding this most basic right—for all Americans.

Yet, this Congress—thanks to the Republican Leadership—has failed to do the necessary work to restore the protections in the Voting Rights Act.

Earlier this year, my colleagues HAKEEM JEFFRIES, GRACE MENG and I hosted a forum on the Voting Rights Act. We heard from local experts about the need to restore these protections.

Let me conclude simply by saying this—it is shameful this Congress has not addressed this issue. But it is also not surprising. As this House has not acted on gun violence and has not yet allocated appropriate funding to address Zika, or dealt with the Flint water crisis—this is yet one more example of how House Republicans are simply not doing their job.

So, I call on my colleagues—do your job. Let's do the hard work of reinstating these democratic protections so voters are not disenfranchised.

Ms. MENG. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Voting Rights Advancement Act, H.R. 2867, introduced by my friends and colleagues Representatives TERRI SEWELL, LINDA SÁNCHEZ, and JUDY CHU. It is long past time that we take up their bipartisan bill, which would restore the protections of the Voting Rights Act.

Mr. Speaker, I think it surprises few of us that following the Supreme Court's misguided decision in *Shelby County v. Holder*, the right to vote has been increasingly attacked in states across the country. The court's decision invalidated the coverage formula in the Voting Rights Act by which certain states and jurisdictions with a history of discrimination were required to preclear election changes with the U.S. Department of Justice. The results have been grave. Since 2010, twenty-two states have implemented new voting restrictions that make it more difficult for students, seniors, those with disabilities, and minorities to vote. This past summer alone, federal courts struck down new prohibitive voting laws in five different states. Federal protections, such as

preclearance, prevent these pernicious laws from being passed in the first place, and this recent surge of court cases only underscores the importance of restoring the Voting Rights Act. Disenfranchisement and voter discrimination are realities that Americans face across the country, including in my district in New York City.

To further investigate the effects of voter discrimination, I hosted a Voting Rights Forum this past May through the leadership of the Democratic Outreach and Engagement Task Force with my colleagues Representatives VELÁZQUEZ and JEFFRIES. We were fortunate to host voting rights experts to talk about the effects of the Shelby County decision on our constituents.

I invited Jerry Vattamala from the Asian American Legal Defense and Education Fund to talk about the particular barriers that the Asian-American community faces to participating in the electoral process, and why Congress needs to restore the Voting Rights Act. I include in the RECORD his testimony from the event:

STATEMENT OF THE ASIAN AMERICAN LEGAL DEFENSE AND EDUCATION FUND JERRY VATTAMALA, ESQ. DIRECTOR, DEMOCRACY PROGRAM HEARING

“FRAGILE AT FIFTY: THE URGENT NEED TO STRENGTHEN AND RESTORE THE VOTING RIGHTS ACT” BEFORE HON. NYDIA VELAZQUEZ, HON. GRACE MENG AND HON. HAKEEM JEFFRIES, NEW YORK CITY

MAY 20, 2016

The Asian American Legal Defense and Education Fund (AALDEF) is a 42-year-old national civil rights organization based in New York City that promotes and protects the civil rights of Asian Americans through litigation, legal advocacy, and community education.

Enforcement of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (VRA) has been critical in preventing actual and threatened discrimination aimed at Asian Americans in national and local elections. As a result of the Supreme Court's decision in *Shelby County v. Holder*, Asian American voters have suffered a serious rollback in their right to vote. AALDEF submits this testimony to elucidate the precarious landscape of Asian American voting rights in wake of the decision in *Shelby County v. Holder*.

AALDEF has monitored elections and conducted annual multilingual exit polls since 1988. Consequently, AALDEF has collected valuable data that documents the continued need for the VRA's protections. In 2012, AALDEF dispatched over 800 attorneys, law students, and community volunteers to 127 poll sites in 14 states to document voter problems on Election Day. The survey polled 9,298 Asian American voters. In 2014, AALDEF surveyed 4,102 Asian American voters at 64 poll sites in 37 cities in 11 states.

Many voting problems that we observed in 2012 have persisted through 2014 and beyond. Operating without the preclearance provisions, the most effective tool of the VRA, the Department of Justice has lost its ability to block voting changes before they occur. As a result, AALDEF and other organizations and individuals have had to engage in more affirmative litigation to protect the fundamental right to vote.

AALDEF has previously submitted testimony to Congress, filed amicus briefs in the Supreme Court of the United States, and released detailed reports regarding Asian American voting problems and the continued need for the full protections of the VRA, including Section 5 preclearance.

Asian Americans continue to face pervasive and current discrimination in voting, particularly in jurisdictions that were previously covered for Section 5 preclearance. For example, in the 2004 primary elections in Bayou La Batre, Alabama, supporters of a white incumbent running against Phuong Tan Huynh, a Vietnamese American candidate, made a concerted effort to intimidate Asian American voters. They challenged Asian Americans at the polls, falsely accusing them of not being U.S. citizens or city residents, or of having felony convictions. The challenged voters were forced to complete a paper ballot and have that ballot vouched for by a registered voter. In explaining his and his supporters' actions, the losing incumbent stated, “We figured if they couldn't speak good English, they possibly weren't American citizens.” The Department of Justice (DOJ) investigated the allegations and found them to be racially motivated. As a result, the challengers were prohibited from interfering in the general election, and Bayou La Batre, for the first time, elected an Asian American to the City Council.

Also in 2004, New York poll workers required Asian American voters to provide naturalization certificates before they could vote. At another poll site, a police officer demanded that all Asian American voters show photo identification, even though photo ID is not required to vote in New York elections. If voters could not produce such identification, the officer turned them away and told them to go home.

Overt racism and discrimination against Asian Americans at the polls persists to the present day and will worsen without Section 5 to combat such behavior. Prior to the Supreme Court's decision, voting rights advocates used Section 5 to protect Asian American voters in redistricting, changes to voting systems, and changes to polling sites. The following are recent examples of harmful actions against Asian American voters that were stopped by Section 5. Now that the coverage formula has been struck, and many jurisdictions are no longer covered by Section 5, Asian Americans are once again vulnerable to nefarious discriminatory actions such as these that will weaken their voting rights and power.

For example, redistricting plans continue to be drafted with discriminatory intent in states with large Asian American communities. As shown in *Perry v. Perez*, 132 S. Ct. 934 (2012), the Texas Legislature drafted a redistricting plan, Plan H283, that would have had significant negative effects on the ability of minorities, and Asian Americans in particular, to exercise their right to vote.

Since 2004, the Asian American community in Texas State House District 149 has voted as a bloc with Hispanic and African American voters to elect Hubert Vo, a Vietnamese American, as their state representative. District 149 has a combined minority citizen voting-age population of 62 percent. Texas is home to the third-largest Asian American community in the United States, growing 72 percent between 2000 and 2010.

In 2011, the Texas Legislature sought to eliminate Vo's State House seat and redistribute the coalition of minority voters to the surrounding three districts with larger non-minority populations. Plan H283 would have thus abridged the Asian American community's right to vote in Texas by diluting the large Asian American populations across the state.

In addition to discrimination in redistricting, Asian American voters have also endured voting system changes that impair their ability to elect candidates of choice. For example, before 2001 in New York City, the only electoral success for Asian Americans was on local community school boards.

In each election—in 1993, 1996, and 1999—Asian American candidates ran for the school board and won. These victories were due, in part, to the alternative voting system known as “single transferable voting” or “preference voting.” Instead of selecting one representative from single-member districts, voters ranked candidates in order of preference, from “1” to “9.” In 1998, New York attempted to switch from a “preference voting” system, where voters ranked their choices, to a “limited voting” system, where voters could select only four candidates for the nine-member board, and the nine candidates with the highest number of votes were elected. This change would have put Asian American voters in a worse position to elect candidates of their choice.

Furthermore, the ability of Asian Americans to vote is also frustrated by sudden changes to poll sites without informing voters. For example, there have been numerous instances of sudden poll site closures in Asian American neighborhoods in New York City, where the Board of Elections failed to take reasonable steps to ensure that Asian American voters are informed of their correct poll sites. Voters have been misinformed about their poll sites before the elections or have been misdirected by poll workers on Election Day, thus creating confusion for Asian American voters and disrupting their ability to vote.

In 2001, primary elections in New York City were rescheduled due to the attacks on the World Trade Center. The week before the rescheduled primaries, AALDEF discovered that a certain poll site, I.S. 131, a school located in the heart of Chinatown and within the restricted zone in lower Manhattan, was being used by the Federal Emergency Management Agency for services related to the World Trade Center attacks. The Board chose to close down the poll site and no notice was given to voters. The Board provided no media release to the Asian-language newspapers, made no attempts to send out a mailing to voters, and failed to arrange for the placement of signs or poll workers at the site to redirect voters to other sites. In fact, no consideration at all was made for the fact that the majority of voters at this site were limited English proficient, and that the site had been targeted for Asian language assistance under Section 203. With Section 5 no longer applicable in most jurisdictions, disruptive changes to polling sites, voting systems, and redistricting plans can now occur unfettered, wreaking havoc on Asian American voters’ ability to cast an effective ballot.

American citizens of Asian ancestry have long been targeted as foreigners and unwanted immigrants, and racism and discrimination against Asian Americans persist to this day. These negative perceptions have real consequences for the ability of Asian Americans to fully participate in the electoral and political process. Section 5 of the VRA was an effective tool in protecting Asian American voters against a host of actions that threaten to curtail their voting rights. However, the Supreme Court’s recent decision dismantling the coverage formula has left a large gap in protections for Asian American voters that requires Congressional action. We look to Congress to work in a bipartisan fashion to respond to the Court’s ruling and strengthen the VRA, as it did during the 2006 reauthorizations and each previous reauthorization. We respectfully offer our assistance in such a process.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, in just three days, the National Museum of African American History & Culture will officially open its doors to the public. One hundred years in the making, the museum explores the richness

and diversity of the African American experience.

As a former public school history teacher in Charleston, South Carolina and a lifelong student of history, I have always worked to improve our understanding of the past. History frames our views on current events and has been called the study of human nature by using examples.

The struggle for the right to vote is an important part of that history. It’s a history that I know quite well—having lived through some of it. I met my wife while in jail for helping to organize one of the biggest student demonstrations in the South. More than one thousand students from South Carolina State and Claflin University assembled to march to downtown Orangeburg in March 1960. 388 of us were arrested.

A few months later, in October 1960, I met John Lewis and Dr. King on the campus of Morehouse College in Atlanta, Georgia. We were seeking the right to vote.

When the Voting Rights Act was signed into law in August 1965, it restored the promise of the 19th amendment. It prohibited racial discrimination in voting and has been called the most successful piece of civil rights legislation in American history.

It was reauthorized by Congress on a strong bipartisan basis in 1970, 1975, 1982, 1992 and, most recently, in 2006.

I testified before the House Judiciary Subcommittee on Civil and Constitutional Rights in support of extending Section 5, with its strong preclearance requirements, in 1981. I was South Carolina’s Human Affairs Commissioner at the time. At the time, the preclearance requirements were necessary to prevent states with a history of discrimination from engaging in further discriminatory practices. They were necessary again in 1992, in 2006, and they still are necessary today.

With no coverage formula in place for the last three years, states have been free to engage in nefarious schemes to suppress minority turnout, dilute the voting strength of communities of color, erect new barriers to the ballot box and make it harder for millions of Americans to exercise their constitutional right to vote.

And they have.

When Americans go to the ballot box in less than fifty days they’ll find new voting restrictions in place in 17 states for the first time in a presidential election.

Nearly 8 million Latino voters living in previously covered jurisdictions will be vulnerable to voting discrimination and changes in election administration.

Five federal lawsuits involving Native American voting rights in ND, UT, SD, AZ and AK have been filed since *Shelby County v. Holder*.

North Carolina’s legislature got to work within hours of the *Shelby County* decision on its “monster” voting law which imposed strict photo ID requirements and cut back early voting. The state has spent more than \$5 million defending the law—which the 4th Circuit said, “target[ed] African Americans with almost surgical precision” and “impose[d] cures for problems that did not exist.”

Six former preclearance states have closed voter registration offices and moved or closed polling places. And six local jurisdictions have redrawn districts or changed the rules to dilute minority votes.

In Georgia alone, 372,000 voters have been purged or removed from the voter rolls in the last two years with little or no awareness. And in Hancock County, one in twenty voters—virtually all African-Americans—were removed from the voting rolls and sheriff’s deputies began showing up at their homes commanding they defend themselves at board meetings as a so-called “courtesy.”

Texas has spent more than \$3.5 million defending its discriminatory photo ID law and just yesterday, was ordered by a federal court to stop purposefully misleading voters about the requirements to vote.

A recent study from 2006–2014 found that the racial turnout gap doubles or triples in states with strict voter ID requirements. They concluded that “strict voter identification laws substantially alter the makeup of who votes and ultimately skew democracy in favor of whites and those on the political right.”

I’m not reading from a history book. This is happening right now—in the United States of America in 2016.

This Congress—Republicans in this Congress—have done little more than pay lip service to voting rights for the last three years. As we approach the upcoming election, I cannot help but feel as if the lessons of history are creeping up on us. Let us not be doomed to repeat it.

Congress must restore the Voting Rights Act. We can do it immediately and we should.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, in the fifty plus years since the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., articulated the dream of a generation, this nation has seen inspiring progress toward the ideal of equality under the law. Nowhere has this progress been more dramatic than in the arena of voting rights. The passage of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 heralded a new era of political opportunity for African-Americans not seen since Reconstruction.

At the state and local level, Section 5 of the Act—which required jurisdictions with a history of voting discrimination to obtain advanced approval for voting changes—was especially important in leveling the playing field by shifting notice requirements and the burden of proof to jurisdictions with a history of discrimination, rather than relying on traditional litigation which would have taken years and countless costs to root out patterns of discrimination in voting. More than any other provision of the Act, Section 5 can be credited with the sustained progress to voting equality.

The Supreme Court, in its 5–4 *Shelby County v. Holder* decision from 2013, has suspended implementation of the Section 5 preclearance program by invalidating the formula used to designate covered jurisdictions. This decision has seriously undermined the nation’s progress toward equal voting rights by allowing discriminatory voting measures to evade streamlined review and requiring minority voters to engage in costly protracted litigation.

In the wake of a divided Supreme Court, many former Section 5 covered states have enacted harsh “second generation” obstacles to voting rights, such as restrictive voter ID laws, limits on early voting and voter registration, and bans on ex-offenders from being able to regain their voting rights. Most of these voter suppression measures have a disproportionate impact on minorities, seniors, young people, and other historically-disadvantaged individuals. Not surprisingly, an ever increasing number of voters on election day are

plagued by long lines at the polls, confusing voter rules, and restrictions intended to deter them from voting.

Literally days after Supreme Court issued the Shelby County ruling, formerly covered jurisdictions enacted discriminatory voting practices that would have been blocked by Section 5 or not even attempted passage of legislation. Texas implemented its restrictive photo ID law, which had been previously blocked by Section 5. The North Carolina state legislature passed a law that imposed a strict photo ID requirement, significantly cut back on early voting, and reduced the window for voter registration. Alabama moved ahead with its law requiring strict photo ID to vote. And Mississippi officials moved to enforce its photo ID law, which the state submitted for preclearance but was never allowed to implement.

In 2013 and 2014, at least 10 of the 15 states that had been covered in whole or in part by Section 5 introduced new restrictive legislation that would make it harder for minority voters to cast a ballot. These have passed in two states: Virginia (stricter photo ID requirement and increased restrictions on third-party voter registration) and North Carolina (the above-discussed omnibus bill, which included the ID requirement, early voting cutbacks, and the elimination of same-day voter registration).

Further, seven other formerly covered states also passed restrictive legislation in 2011 and 2012, prior to the Shelby County decision in anticipation of victory.

Section 5's loss perhaps has been felt most acutely at the local level. The great majority of voting law changes that were blocked as discriminatory under the Voting Rights Act were enacted at the local level: counties, municipalities, and other state sub-jurisdictions. We have witnessed local jurisdictions step into the void left by Section 5 to pass all manner of discriminatory voting procedures: discriminatory local redistricting plans; closing polling places and DMV's in minority communities and changing election dates, just to name a few.

Though Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act is still available to challenge these discriminatory practices, the time and expense of litigation leaves these practices in place to do years of damage and places a substantial burden on the rights of minority voters. It took years of litigation to roll back the challenged practices mentioned earlier in Texas and North Carolina.

We will enter a Presidential election without Section 5 protection for the first time in 50 years. The danger to our democratic process cannot be overstated. Already, we have heard political candidates discussing voting intimidation tactics and we must focus on the status of federal observers under the law.

As a staunch proponent, and a remaining member of Congress who voted for the Act in 1965, I joined Representative SENSENBRENNER to introduce H.R. 885, the Voting Rights Amendment Act, which is designed to restore the vitality and effectiveness of Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act.

Though we have made progress in the courts over the past several weeks in overturning some of these voter suppression measures, the states and some localities have been quick to re-enact substitute measures. This tactic was the very reason for the enact-

ment of Section 5 in the first place and evidence of the need for reauthorizing legislation.

In addressing these calculated voter suppression tactics, we cannot forget those who have lost their voting rights and have no voice in government. Currently, nearly 4 million of disqualified voters are not in prison, but on probation or parole. Nearly 3 million of the disenfranchised have completed their entire sentence, including probation and parole. I believe that such prohibitions on voting undermine the fundamental rights of people with felony convictions.

To correct this injustice, I have introduced H.R. 1459, the Democracy Restoration Act which declares the right of a U.S. citizen to vote in any election for federal office shall not be denied because that individual has been convicted of a criminal offense.

Just as the Brennan Center has observed in their report on voting rights post-Shelby County, "For all the real progress Section 5 facilitated, the nation and its voters now lack a critical tool to protect those earned advances. Bad laws with lasting, harmful consequences now lack a review mechanism, the method of fighting these laws is now limited to costly and time-intensive litigation, and the public has lost the one centralized means to track the thousands of changes annually that affect Americans' right to vote."

Just as Congress ignored political headwinds and set partisan differences aside five decades ago to prohibit discriminatory voting practices, this Congress must again muster the political courage to enact legislation to protect the voting rights of all Americans.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A Bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 3076. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to furnish caskets and urns for burial in cemeteries of States and tribal organizations of veterans without next of kin or sufficient resources to provide for caskets or urns, and for other purposes; to the committee on Veterans' Affairs.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 5936. An act to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to enter into certain leases at the Department of Veterans Affairs West Los Angeles Campus in Los Angeles, California, to make certain improvements to the enhanced-use lease authority of the Department, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5985. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend certain expiring provisions of law administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 24 minutes

p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, September 22, 2016, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

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. CHAFFETZ: Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. H.R. 5995. A bill to strike the sunset on certain provisions relating to the authorized protest of a task or delivery order under section 4106 of title 41, United States Code (Rept. 114-779). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GOODLATTE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2315. A bill to limit the authority of States to tax certain income of employees for employment duties performed in other States (Rept. 114-780). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BYRNE: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 879. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5931) to provide for the prohibition on cash payments to the Government of Iran, and for other purposes, and waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules (Rept. 114-781). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. GOODLATTE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5982. A bill to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to provide for en bloc consideration in resolutions of disapproval for "midnight rules", and for other purposes (Rept. 114-782, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on Rules discharged from further consideration. H.R. 5982 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

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. VARGAS (for himself, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. VELA, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. VEASEY):

H.R. 6091. A bill to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to identify aliens who have served, or are serving, in the Armed Forces of the United States when those aliens apply for an immigration benefit or are placed in an immigration enforcement proceeding, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VARGAS (for himself, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. VELA, Mrs. DAVIS of California, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO):

H.R. 6092. A bill to amend section 212(d)(5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act to allow certain alien veterans to be paroled into the United States to receive health care furnished by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VARGAS (for himself, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. VELA, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H.R. 6093. A bill to establish naturalization offices at initial military training sites; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WALBERG (for himself, Mr. KLINE, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. MESSER, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. BRAT, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Mr. GROTHMAN, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. HARDY, Mr. HILL, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. BENISHEK, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. KNIGHT, Mr. BARR, and Mr. DOLD):

H.R. 6094. A bill to provide for a 6-month delay in the effective date of a rule of the Department of Labor relating to income thresholds for determining overtime pay for executive, administrative, professional, outside sales, and computer employees; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. LEE (for herself, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. POLIS, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. TITUS, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. HONDA, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, and Ms. FUDGE):

H.R. 6095. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Education to carry out a program to increase access to prekindergarten through grade 12 computer science education; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mrs. WALORSKI (for herself, Miss RICE of New York, and Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 6096. A bill to provide for the reconsideration of claims for disability compensation for veterans who were the subjects of experiments by the Department of Defense during World War II that were conducted to assess the effects of mustard gas or lewisite on people, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, 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 Mr. SERRANO (for himself, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. GALLEGRO, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mrs. TORRES, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. HONDA, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. HASTINGS, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. LEE, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. EDWARDS, and Mr. KENNEDY):

H.R. 6097. A bill to amend section 236 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to modify the conditions on the detention of aliens, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SANFORD (for himself, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. BRAT):

H.R. 6098. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the withholding of income and social security taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUFFMAN (for himself and Ms. ESHOO):

H.R. 6099. A bill to support the establishment and improvement of communications sites on or adjacent to Federal lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture through

the retention and use of rental fees associated with such sites, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, 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 Mr. DAVIDSON (for himself, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. HARPER, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. BRAT, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. COLE, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. YOHO, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. FLORES, Mrs. HARTZLER, and Mr. MESSER):

H.R. 6100. A bill to prevent proposed regulations relating to restrictions on liquidation of an interest with respect to estate, gift, and generation-skipping transfer taxes from taking effect; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. BLACK (for herself and Mr. WELCH):

H.R. 6101. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve the Medicare accountable care organization (ACO) program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, 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 Mr. CÁRDENAS:

H.R. 6102. A bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to establish a Smart Technology Traffic Signals Grant Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. COHEN (for himself and Mr. ROSS):

H.R. 6103. A bill to provide standards for physical condition and management of housing receiving assistance payments under section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana (for himself, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. RICHMOND, and Mr. ABRAHAM):

H.R. 6104. A bill to establish a deadline for approval of claims made under the National Flood Insurance Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. JONES (for himself and Mr. BUTTERFIELD):

H.R. 6105. A bill to amend the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 to designate certain parts of United States Route 264 and the Eastern North Carolina Gateway Corridor as future parts of the Interstate System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. KUSTER (for herself and Mrs. BUSTOS):

H.R. 6106. A bill to establish a single export promotion agency in the executive branch, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TED LIEU of California:

H.R. 6107. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to enter into agreements with public and private entities to provide pro bono legal services to homeless veterans and veterans at risk of homelessness, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LOEBSACK (for himself, Mr. STIVERS, Mrs. BUSTOS, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. JONES, Mr. HONDA, Mr. GALLEGRO, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. CURBELO of Flor-

ida, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. WALZ, Mr. MARINO, Mr. COOPER, Mr. SWALLOW of California, Mr. BLUM, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. HUNTER, and Mr. SABLAN):

H.R. 6108. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to ensure that certain veterans receive in-patient psychiatric care provided by the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PALLONE (for himself, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, and Mr. MCDERMOTT):

H.R. 6109. A bill to amend titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act to improve the affordability and enrollment procedures of the Medicare program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and Transportation and Infrastructure, 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 Mr. PERRY (for himself, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, and Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina):

H.R. 6110. A bill to amend section 412(a)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act to require ratification of a plan with respect to a refugee by the legislature of a State before the refugee may be initially placed or resettled in the State, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN of Ohio:

H.R. 6111. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a partial exclusion from the excise tax imposed on heavy trucks sold at retail for alternative fuel trucks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. TORRES:

H.R. 6112. A bill to require the Small Business Administration to make information relating to lenders making covered loans publicly available, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN:

H.R. 6113. A bill to restrict the authority of the Attorney General to enter into contracts for Federal correctional facilities and community confinement facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WENSTRUP (for himself and Mr. HECK of Nevada):

H.R. 6114. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to furnish caskets and urns for burial in cemeteries of States and tribal organizations of veterans without next of kin or sufficient resources to provide for caskets or urns, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 6115. A bill to fulfill the land conveyance requirements under the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act for the Alaska Native Village of Canyon Village, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. LEWIS (for himself and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H. Con. Res. 158. Concurrent resolution recognizing the International Day of Peace; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. MCCAUL (for himself, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. ROYCE):

H. Con. Res. 159. Concurrent resolution condemning the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran for the 1988 massacre of political prisoners and calling for justice for the victims; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. LAWRENCE:

H. Res. 880. A resolution expressing support for a uniform adoption process of children

from foster care and promoting the enactment by all States of the Interstate Compact for the Placement of Children to ensure more children in the United States are placed in safe, loving, and permanent homes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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 Mr. BEYER (for himself, Mr. HONDA, Mr. HIMES, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. TONKO, Mr. NEAL, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. LEE, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. WALZ, Mr. POCAN, Mr. COSTA, Mr. LEWIS, Ms. TITUS, Ms. KUSTER, and Mr. MCDERMOTT):

H. Res. 881. A resolution recognizing the 55th anniversary of the Fulbright-Hays Programs; to the Committee on 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. VARGAS:

H.R. 6091.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following section of the U.S. Constitution:

(1) To establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 4 of the U.S. Constitution;

(2) To raise and support armies, but no appropriation of money to that use shall be for a longer term than two years, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 12 of the U.S. Constitution;

(3) To provide and maintain a navy, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 13 of the U.S. Constitution; and

(4) To make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 14 of the U.S. Constitution.

(5) To make all 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, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. VARGAS:

H.R. 6092.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following section of the U.S. Constitution:

(1) To establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 4 of the U.S. Constitution;

(2) To raise and support armies, but no appropriation of money to that use shall be for a longer term than two years, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 12 of the U.S. Constitution;

(3) To provide and maintain a navy, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 13 of the U.S. Constitution; and

(4) To make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 14 of the U.S. Constitution.

(5) To make all 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, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. VARGAS:

H.R. 6093.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following section of the U.S. Constitution:

(1) To establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 4 of the U.S. Constitution;

(2) To raise and support armies, but no appropriation of money to that use shall be for a longer term than two years, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 12 of the U.S. Constitution;

(3) To provide and maintain a navy, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 13 of the U.S. Constitution; and

(4) To make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 14 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. WALBERG:

H.R. 6094.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Ms. LEE:

H.R. 6095.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8,
Clause 1

“The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;”

Clause 3

“To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes;”

Clause 8

“To promote the progress of science and useful arts, by securing for limited times to authors and inventors the exclusive right to their respective writings and discoveries;”

By Mrs. WALORSKI:

H.R. 6096.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. SERRANO:

H.R. 6097.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 4, which states that “Congress shall have the power . . . to establish a uniform rule of naturalization,” and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, which states that “Congress shall have the power . . . To make all 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 officer or department thereof.”

By Mr. SANFORD:

H.R. 6098.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

the Sixteenth Amendment of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. HUFFMAN:

H.R. 6099.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all otehr Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or office thereof

By Mr. DAVIDSON:

H.R. 6100.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1: Since valuation rules affect the collection of taxes, laws determining their use are constitutional under Congressional authority to lay and collect taxes.

By Mrs. BLACK:

H.R. 6101.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes.

By Mr. CÁRDENAS:

H.R. 6102.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 6103.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution

By Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana:

H.R. 6104.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Art 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. JONES:

H.R. 6105.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article 1, Section 8, Clauses:

1) The Congress shall have Power to . . . provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States

3) To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes

7) To establish Post Offices and post Roads

18) To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested in this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Ms. KUSTER:

H.R. 6106.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution, the Taxing and Spending Clause: “To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes . . .”

By Mr. TED LIEU of California:

H.R. 6107.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. LOEBSACK:

H.R. 6108.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause I of the Constitution which grants Congress the power to provide for the general Welfare of the United States.

By Mr. PALLONE:

H.R. 6109.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. PERRY:

H.R. 6110.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. RYAN of Ohio:

H.R. 6111.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

“The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.”

By Mrs. TORRES:

H.R. 6112.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN:

H.R. 6113.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Sections 1 and 8

By Mr. WENSTRUP:

H.R. 6114.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 6115.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 and Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 21: Mr. GOSAR.

H.R. 167: Mr. MCNERNEY and Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.

H.R. 188: Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H.R. 213: Mr. PALLONE and Mr. ISRAEL.

H.R. 592: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.

H.R. 704: Mr. GOSAR.

H.R. 746: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 932: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 1006: Mr. AGUILAR.

H.R. 1025: Ms. LEE, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. RUSH, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. NORTON, Mr. SERRANO, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, and Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 1089: Mr. KIND and Mr. DENHAM.

H.R. 1095: Mr. AGUILAR.

H.R. 1142: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 1151: Mr. LUTKEMEYER.

H.R. 1153: Mr. HENSARLING.

H.R. 1185: Mr. GUTHRIE and Mr. FLORES.

H.R. 1283: Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 1319: Mr. RICE of South Carolina.

H.R. 1492: Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 1516: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 1550: Mr. AGUILAR.

H.R. 1687: Mr. CUMMINGS.

H.R. 1728: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. SCHIFF, Mrs. LOWEY, and Ms. FUDGE.

H.R. 1733: Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 1861: Mr. GOSAR.

H.R. 1941: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 2287: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 2290: Mr. BABIN.

H.R. 2434: Ms. LEE.

H.R. 2441: Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 2521: Mr. LANGEVIN.

H.R. 2597: Mr. MOULTON.

H.R. 2660: Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. HONDA, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. COHEN, and Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 2698: Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.

H.R. 2715: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. PASCRELL, and Ms. CLARKE of New York.

H.R. 2858: Mr. KIND and Mr. MOULTON.

H.R. 2972: Mr. YARMUTH.

H.R. 3084: Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 3099: Mr. YARMUTH.

H.R. 3280: Ms. SINEMA.

H.R. 3323: Mr. NEUGEBAUER and Mr. STIVERS.

H.R. 3381: Mr. LATTA.

H.R. 3522: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 3546: Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. SERRANO, and Mr. NORCROSS.

H.R. 3599: Mr. ROE of Tennessee.

H.R. 3660: Ms. ESTY.

H.R. 3886: Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. RUSH, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. KUSTER, Ms. FUDGE, and Mrs. LOWEY.

H.R. 3892: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas and Mr. ZELDIN.

H.R. 3929: Mr. AGUILAR.

H.R. 4140: Mr. TROTT.

H.R. 4151: Mr. HANNA.

H.R. 4211: Mr. TIPTON.

H.R. 4298: Miss RICE of New York, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. PETERS, Mr. HARDY, Mr. DENHAM, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. DEFazio, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. COOK, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. MARINO, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia.

H.R. 4475: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

H.R. 4488: Mr. GALLEGO.

H.R. 4505: Mr. POCAN, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. SCHRADER, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, and Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 4559: Mr. NEUGEBAUER.

H.R. 4592: Mr. SHIMKUS and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.

H.R. 4622: Mr. COLE.

H.R. 4657: Mr. HANNA, Mr. GUINTA, and Mr. TROTT.

H.R. 4760: Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 4784: Mr. HIMES, Ms. LEE, Mrs. LAWRENCE, and Mr. COSTA.

H.R. 4796: Ms. PINGREE.

H.R. 4907: Mrs. LOVE and Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.

H.R. 4919: Ms. DELBENE, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. NADLER, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. COLLINS of New York, and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 4927: Mr. PETERSON.

H.R. 4932: Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 5008: Mr. AGUILAR.

H.R. 5061: Mr. WEBER of Texas.

H.R. 5082: Mr. MARINO, Mr. CLEAVER, and Mr. HOLDING.

H.R. 5122: Mr. GUTHRIE.

H.R. 5167: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.

H.R. 5180: Mr. HUNTER.

H.R. 5235: Mrs. DAVIS of California.

H.R. 5251: Mr. KATKO.

H.R. 5256: Mr. NOLAN, Mr. O'ROURKE, and Mr. VEASEY.

H.R. 5263: Ms. DELBENE and Miss RICE of New York.

H.R. 5373: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

H.R. 5392: Mr. LUTKEMEYER.

H.R. 5410: Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. ROSS, and Mr. MULVANEY.

H.R. 5418: Mr. YOHO, Mr. YODER, and Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 5428: Mr. ISSA.

H.R. 5436: Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 5466: Mr. JOYCE.

H.R. 5474: Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 5499: Mr. RENACCI and Mr. EMMER of Minnesota.

H.R. 5549: Mr. ROHRBACHER and Ms. NOR-TON.

H.R. 5560: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 5579: Mr. CALVERT and Mr. MARINO.

H.R. 5600: Ms. KUSTER, Mr. KLINE, and Mrs. ROBY.

H.R. 5622: Mr. VARGAS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RUSH, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Ms. SEWELL of Alabama.

H.R. 5624: Mr. WEBER of Texas and Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 5682: Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 5691: Mr. GUTÉRREZ.

H.R. 5720: Mr. SWALWELL of California.

H.R. 5721: Mr. PETERSON.

H.R. 5732: Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 5768: Mr. ZELDIN.

H.R. 5790: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.

H.R. 5813: Mr. RIBBLE.

H.R. 5814: Mr. BYRNE.

H.R. 5816: Mr. MCKINLEY.

H.R. 5817: Mr. BONAMICI and Mr. SANFORD.

H.R. 5829: Mr. KNIGHT and Mr. SMITH of Texas.

H.R. 5853: Mr. SMITH of Missouri and Mr. LONG.

H.R. 5864: Mr. VELÁZQUEZ.

H.R. 5904: Mr. NEUGEBAUER and Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 5932: Mr. KING of New York and Ms. STEFANIK.

H.R. 5942: Mr. KUSTER.

H.R. 5953: Ms. NORTON, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. PALLONE, and Mr. HINOJOSA.

H.R. 5961: Mr. ZELDIN and Mr. WEBER of Texas.

H.R. 5978: Mr. CUELLAR.

H.R. 5980: Mr. BYRNE, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. DESAULNIER, and Ms. KELLY of Illinois.

H.R. 5999: Mr. VEASEY.

H.R. 6003: Mr. BYRNE and Mr. BRIDENSTINE.

H.R. 6010: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

H.R. 6015: Mr. FORTENBERRY.

H.R. 6017: Mr. FOSTER.

H.R. 6039: Mr. HECK of Nevada and Mr. AMODEI.

H.R. 6045: Mr. KIND.

H.R. 6049: Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan and Mr. WALKER.

H.R. 6059: Mr. PETERS and Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 6061: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 6066: Mr. KNIGHT.

H.R. 6072: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. BASS, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Ms. LEE, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, and Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H.R. 6073: Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. BASS, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. LEE, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, and Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H.R. 6087: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. JONES, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. WALZ, and Mr. BURGESS.

H.R. 6088: Mr. BUCSHON, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. AMODEI, and Mr. JOYCE.

H.J. Res. 98: Ms. EDWARDS.

H. Con. Res. 40: Ms. DELAURO.

H. Con. Res. 114: Mr. SALMON.

H. Con. Res. 140: Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. REED, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. WALDEN, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. POSEY, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. ZELDIN, and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H. Con. Res. 141: Mr. LEVIN, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, and Ms. NORTON.

H. Con. Res. 155: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.

H. Res. 346: Mr. ROUZER.
H. Res. 831: Mr. GROTHMAN.
H. Res. 840: Ms. LOFGREN.
H. Res. 845: Mr. PASCRELL.
H. Res. 848: Mr. KATKO.
H. Res. 850: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H. Res. 851: Mrs. LOVE and Mr. ROONEY of Florida.
H. Res. 853: Mr. ALLEN, Mr. HENSARLING, and Mr. CALVERT.
H. Res. 854: Mr. POCAN.

H. Res. 861: Mr. CICILLINE and Ms. LOFGREN.

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:

OFFERED BY MR. ROYCE

The amendment to H.R. 5931 (Prohibiting Future Ransom Payments to Iran Act) that I filed with the Committee on Rules, listed as amendment number one in that committee's report on the bill, 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, SEPTEMBER 21, 2016

No. 143

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.

Our Father, we wait in reverence before Your throne. Cleanse us from our sins, creating in us clean hearts while renewing a right spirit within us.

Help our lawmakers today to discern Your voice and do Your will. Give them the ability to differentiate Your guidance from all others, permitting You to lead them to Your desired destination. Grant them, O God, minds to know, hearts to seek You, wisdom to find You, and conduct to please You. Speak to them through Your Word, guide them with Your Spirit, and sustain them with Your might.

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.

CONTINUING RESOLUTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, yesterday the Senate took the next step in allowing us to eventually pass a continuing resolution. While negotiations are ongoing, I want to thank colleagues on both sides for their cooperation in voting to proceed to the bill that will be used as a shell for the CR-

Zika legislation. This will allow us to start work so that when we have an agreement, we will be able to review and debate it.

We all know how important these funds are for combating Zika and supporting our veterans. Let's continue to work quickly so we can eventually pass an agreement as soon as possible.

OBAMACARE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, on another matter, my friend the Democratic leader has a favorite saying. He often says that the definition of insanity is doing the same thing over and over and expecting a different result. I am not sure his fellow Democrats got the memo.

At a time when ObamaCare is raising health costs dramatically and chasing competition out of the health industry and collapsing on itself, Democrats just rolled out a brandnew health care idea to fix the problem that even they grudgingly admit is plaguing families. And what is their answer? More ObamaCare. No, this is not a joke. Democrats actually introduced legislation last week calling for ObamaCare 2.0, a new government-run health plan. It is not as if this is even a new idea. It is just a stale leftover from the health care debate back in 2009, an idea many Democrats once deemed so bad that it was cut from the final ObamaCare bill, but now it is their Hail Mary.

It is beyond tone deaf, and there are good reasons that so many in their own caucus will not support it. It is insulting to millions of Americans who continue to watch their premiums spike after Democrats said they would be lower. It is insulting to the millions of Americans who continue to watch their out-of-pocket costs shoot ever higher after Democrats said it would be affordable. I am sure Democrats will make plenty more promises to sell their latest bad idea; I am just not sure

the American people are in a mood to listen anymore.

Health care costs just rose last month by the largest amount in over three decades. Deductibles are outpacing wages, premiums are spiking by double digits just about everywhere and could even increase as much as 60 percent in some places. This is ObamaCare's legacy. It is a direct attack on the middle class. It is ruining lives and making life even harder for those who struggle already.

I have a message for our friends across the aisle: Remember what your leader likes to say about doing the same thing over and over. Stop denying reality, stop pretending this is somebody else's fault, own up to what you have done to the middle class, and then work with us to build a bridge away from it. ObamaCare is scary enough for America's middle class. The last thing Americans need now is some government-run sequel.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

OBAMACARE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, my entire caucus got the message. We understand Einstein's definition of insanity is doing the same thing over and over again, and the over and over again, my friend should understand, is the fact that Republicans have voted 70 times to repeal ObamaCare, each time with the same result. My friend should know that every one of my Senators got the memo, as he said.

If someone would spend a minute each day flipping through the newspapers about health care, they would understand that ObamaCare has changed America for the better. Twenty million people now have the opportunity to go to the doctor when they

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S5913

are sick or to the hospital when they are hurt. That wasn't the way it used to be, and the American people are beginning to realize that the constant carping about ObamaCare from the Republicans is wrong. It is wrong for a number of reasons. The American people are beginning to realize that with just a little bit of help, ObamaCare could be made even better. A report came out yesterday that premiums for ObamaCare are still less than employer programs. It is about 3 percent lower than the company-run plans.

The marketplace is what it is all about, and that is what is determining what is happening with ObamaCare. The disabled can get insurance, young men and women can stay on their parents' insurance until the age of 26. Insurance companies are limited in how they can punish people, as they did in the past. They can't set an arbitrary limit as to how much insurance they would provide. If somebody was hurt in a serious accident, they would just terminate them from the insurance, not to mention all of the other things. We were at their mercy. Obviously Republicans want to go back to that same system, and it is not a good system.

DONALD TRUMP

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I learned a long time ago here in the Senate that the rules of the Senate do not allow pictures, graphs, and things of that nature to go in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and that is really too bad. I wish I had the time this morning—I read the paper this morning—to blow up this cartoon by the syndicated cartoonist of the Washington Post, Tom Toles. I have talked to him a couple of times over the past many decades because he is really good, and today's cartoon is about as good as it gets.

This is a picture that Tom Toles sketched of Donald Trump. I would like everyone to take a look at it. I wish I could put it in the RECORD. It is a cartoon of Donald Trump, and he is saying: "Maybe we need to start 'profiling' huckster haircuts, beady eyes, blowhard lips, unhealthy orange glow, obvious self-dealing"—and he has money pouring out of his pockets—"overweight, underhanded, ever-shifting positions." And, as Toles always has in every cartoon, there is a little person down in the bottom generally making some snide remark about the cartoon, and what that little person says today is that there is a "body of evidence"—the body of Donald Trump, and he is the one who should be profiled, not the people he wants to have profiled.

A little more about Donald Trump—Mitt Romney and I agree on one thing, and that is one thing for sure. There are other things we would agree on, but let's talk about one thing that Mitt Romney and I agree on, and that is that Donald Trump should release his tax returns. But Trump will not release his tax returns. He refuses to release

his returns, and he comes up with one excuse after another to not release his tax returns. It is a little odd because the Donald Trump we are talking about is not known for cautionary restraint; he is the most unhinged and reckless Presidential candidate ever.

Let's consider just a little bit of his track record. We have seen Trump refer to women in the most crude and derogatory manner. We have seen Trump call immigrants murderers and rapists. We have seen Trump fearmonger against Muslim Americans, even the parents of one of our proud soldiers who lost his life fighting for our country. We have seen Trump mock someone with a disability on more than one occasion. We have seen Trump impugn a Federal judge. Why? Because his parents were Hispanic. We have seen Trump continue to question President Obama's country of origin. We have seen Trump casually raise the specter of an assassination against Hillary Clinton on more than one occasion. This is the Donald Trump we know. Donald Trump will do and say anything regardless of the consequences.

Why does Trump refuse to produce his tax returns? Why is this the one time in his life that he exercises caution? Why does he maintain absolute silence on his taxes? The answer is very simple—because Trump's tax returns would further destroy his Presidential candidacy. Production of his tax returns would again prove that he is a fraud. If the American people had access to Donald Trump's tax returns, they would show he is not the billionaire he claims to be. Trump wants us to believe that in spite of all of his bankruptcies and litigations that have been going on for decades, he is the incredibly wealthy, successful businessman that he portrays himself to be. But he is not, and his tax returns will prove he is far from a wealthy Trump.

Donald Trump's tax returns will also prove that he avoids paying his fair share of taxes. On the rare occasion that Donald Trump's tax returns have been made public—that was on one occasion some time ago—they showed that he paid nothing in income taxes. As the Washington Post reported earlier this year:

The last time information from Donald Trump's income-tax returns was made public, the bottom line was striking: He paid the federal government \$0 in income taxes.

Donald Trump is afraid that if his supporters discover that he has avoided paying taxes, they will see him for what he is—someone the IRS should charge with a crime and investigate, or at least do something. He deserves all the scrutiny he can get because he doesn't want us to see what he has in his so-called income.

Perhaps the most damning evidence of Trump's tax records would be that he lives off the American taxpayer. Donald Trump is a freeloader. Even though Trump refuses to pay his share of taxes, he is content to use other taxpayers' hard-earned money.

Yesterday we learned that his charity—they don't put money in it. He gets other charities to donate to his charity, and then he goes out and tries to be a big shot by donating other people's money. Even though Trump refuses to pay his share of taxes, he is content to use other taxpayers' hard-earned money.

One news outlet has reported that over the last three decades Donald Trump has received \$885 million in tax breaks. Let's put that in perspective. In 2014, the entire State of Ohio received \$686 million in Federal funding to provide benefits for needy families. That money helped almost 120,000 people in Ohio. Trump received \$885 million, and the entire State of Ohio received only \$686 million. There is no question about it: Donald Trump is a welfare king, but the welfare king doesn't want voters to see that he doesn't pay taxes even as he uses a billion of taxpayer dollars to keep his bankrupt companies afloat. Trump doesn't want Americans to see that he claims middle-class tax credits.

This is a report in the New York Daily News:

The flame-throwing Republican contender for the White House appears to be the only New York City billionaire who snagged a tax break aimed at middle class homeowners, raising even more questions about his alleged billions.

Continuing to quote:

An analysis of property records for 38 Big Apple billionaires on the 'Forbes 400' list conducted by Crain's New York Business found Trump was the only one to receive the STAR tax credit. That credit . . . gives those entitled to around \$300 off their tax bill.

So is he a billionaire? I doubt it.

Donald Trump, this self-purported billionaire, has been falsely claiming a \$300 tax break for years. He has done it for a number of years. Like a sponge, Donald Trump soaks up all the taxpayer money he can find while at the same time not paying his fair share of taxes.

Remember, the same Donald Trump, who once said:

The problem we have right now, we have a society that sits back and says we're not going to do anything. And eventually the 50 percent cannot carry, and it's unfair to them, but cannot carry the other 50 percent.

I think Donald Trump is confused about who is carrying whom. He is the one relaxing, playing golf at his golf courses, many of which are largely paid for by taxpayer dollars, and depending at the same time on the American taxpayer to bankroll his company and his golf game, but Trump doesn't seem to care. In fact, he brags about how he uses other people's hard-earned money.

Here is what he said yesterday:

It's called OPM: Other people's money. There's nothing wrong with doing things with other people's money. That's what I do.

How could Speaker RYAN, Senator MCCONNELL, and other congressional Republicans endorse this man for President or endorse him for anything? How can they continue to support Donald Trump as he shuns transparency

and refuses to release the most basic information about his taxes and income?

Hillary Clinton has posted all of her tax records for the last four decades for the world to see. Donald Trump shows us nothing. He is afraid to.

Mr. Trump, prove to every American that you are the wealthy, successful man you claim to be.

Mr. Trump, prove to every American that you have paid your fair share of taxes.

Mr. Trump, prove to every American that you are not mooching off the American taxpayer.

Mr. Trump, release your tax returns. Prove me wrong. Prove Mitt Romney wrong.

I dare you to come clean and show us your tax records.

But he won't.

Mr. President, I see my good friend, the Senator from Illinois, the assistant Democratic leader, on the floor.

I now ask the Chair to announce the business of the day.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2017—MOTION TO PROCEED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to H.R. 5325, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 516, H.R. 5325, a bill making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2017, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

WELLS FARGO

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, every morning paper and most of the newscasts this morning focused in on a hearing of the Senate Banking Committee yesterday. It was a hearing where the President of the Wells Fargo bank was called on to testify. At issue was a recent disclosure that over a period of many years, Wells Fargo bank was enrolling its customers, without their knowledge, in the ownership of bank accounts and credit cards. Many times they faced penalties and charges which they did not understand because they had not asked to be enrolled in these programs. The employees at Wells Fargo bank did it in an effort to win favor within their corporate ranks and even to receive bonuses.

This defrauding of thousands of Wells Fargo customers was finally unearthed by the media and by the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau. As a result, a substantial fine of millions of dollars was paid by Wells Fargo bank, and the President, Mr. Stumpf, was called be-

fore the committee yesterday to explain the situation. He faulted the over 5,000 employees of Wells Fargo bank, who he said were not honest in their dealings with their customers, and they were dismissed. There were questions asked of Mr. Stumpf about the responsibility of the management of Wells Fargo bank for this terrible miscarriage of justice and apparently very few, if any, managers were held accountable.

One particular woman who was in a management capacity had been allowed to leave the bank under extremely positive circumstances. She was given a golden parachute of over \$100 million when leaving the bank. So while 5,300 people, making around \$12 an hour, were being dismissed because of their lack of ethics, this managing woman was, in fact, rewarded with a golden parachute of over \$100 million as she left.

Questions were raised by many of my colleagues, including Senator BROWN, and even Republican colleagues were skeptical of this Wells Fargo presentation. Senator ELIZABETH WARREN was particularly poignant in her remarks that so many of the lower echelon employees were found morally culpable and paid a heavy price, while those at the highest ranks, including Mr. Stumpf himself, were compensated grandly for their leadership during this terrible time. It is an indication of what it takes to bring real justice to a free market system.

I am a person who believes America is lucky to have the economy it has, but I also know that throughout history, there have been excesses where people have had to step in—sometimes the media with disclosure and many times the government with oversight and regulation—to right the wrongs which occur in runaway, rampant capitalism. We saw it, of course, in the recession that hit our country in 2008. Many of the largest banks in this country took advantage of individuals and families and businesses. At the end of it, many people lost their savings, their homes, and their jobs because of the greed of Wall Street, but what we are talking about in the area of justice doesn't just apply to financial institutions, it applies to health insurance as well.

AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

Mr. President, on a regular basis now, the leadership on the Republican side of the aisle has come forward to condemn the Affordable Care Act. It apparently is a big issue which they want to take into the election in November. I hope the American people listen carefully to what we have just heard from Senator MCCONNELL, the Republican leader in the Senate.

Day after day, week after week, month after month, and year after year, for the last 5 years, Republicans have come to the floor and said: Let's abolish ObamaCare. Let's end the Affordable Care Act. I am still waiting for the first Republican to come to the

floor and say: And here is what we will replace it with.

There is a saying in downstate Illinois—I will clean it up a little bit—that any mule can kick down a barn door, but it takes a carpenter to build one. In this situation, the Republicans can't wait to kick down the Affordable Care Act, but they don't have any plans to build a replacement.

So here is what they want to do. They want to go back to what they consider the good old days of health insurance in America.

Six years ago, let me tell me colleagues, health insurance in America was no picnic for most American families. Not only was there a steady increase in premiums year after year, but health insurance companies were very picky about the people they would insure. If you happened to be the parents of a child who had weathered the storm and survived cancer treatment, your child had a preexisting condition. If you could get health insurance, you paid a lot for it. The same thing was true if your wife had survived a heart attack, for example, and was now on the mend and doing well. She had a preexisting condition.

So preexisting conditions became the basis for discriminating against American consumers. Who among us comes from such a perfect family without any health record that we can say there are no preexisting conditions in my family. If you don't have one today, you might have one tomorrow.

One of the things about the Affordable Care Act is, we said health insurance companies cannot discriminate against people because of preexisting conditions. In the bad old days, which the Republicans would return to, they could. Under the Affordable Care Act, they cannot.

We also said that lifetime limits on health insurance policies were unacceptable. So \$100,000 may sound like a lot of money until you are diagnosed with cancer, and then you realize the course of treatment is going to blow through that \$100,000 before you are ultimately going to get what the doctor has ordered. So we eliminated the lifetime caps on these policies that were, in fact, creating poverty among many Americans families because of medical diagnoses.

We also eliminated discrimination based on gender. Why was it that a man applying for a health insurance policy was paying less than a woman applying for a health insurance policy? That discrimination was allowed under the bad old days of health insurance that the Republicans want to return to.

We went further and said: If you are parents and have a young son or daughter, they can stay under your family health insurance plan until they reach the age of 26. Why is this important? Because kids out of college are still looking for work. They may not get a full-time job, they may not get health care benefits, but families want the peace of mind to know they are covered

until age 26, until they can have a chance to develop their own health insurance coverage. Under the bad old days, that coverage was not there. The Republicans would like to go back to that. That is a mistake as far as I am concerned.

We also basically said as well that if you are a senior citizen in America, you are not going to be burdened by what was known as the doughnut hole. People in Medicare are given a benefit for prescription drugs, but as the law was originally written, there was a gap in coverage in that benefit called the doughnut hole. You would be covered for the first few months of the year on expensive drugs; then you would be on your own to either pay out of your savings or not take the drugs for several months before coverage started again. We are closing the doughnut hole as part of the Affordable Care Act. The Republicans would take us back to the days of the doughnut hole, where individual retired Americans would face expenses of \$2,000 or more for drugs each year. We are in the process of closing that doughnut hole. The Republicans would take us back to the bad old days when we didn't have that closure.

They would eliminate the coverage of health insurance brought on by the Affordable Care Act for over 20 million Americans—20 million Americans. Senator MCCONNELL would say: Sorry, we are going back to the bad old days. You and your family don't get health care coverage.

There is something we discovered. Even families without health insurance get sick, and when they do get sick and, in the worst of circumstances, turn up at the doctor or the hospital, they are treated, and many times can't pay for it. Who pays for that care? Everyone else. Everyone else who is paying health insurance will pay for it.

We think it is better under the Affordable Care Act. We achieved this: More and more Americans have their own health insurance, both for care when they are sick as well as for preventive care. We provide preventive care under the Affordable Care Act, particularly for senior citizens so they will avoid serious illnesses that get very expensive down the line.

So what has been the net result of this? Not only are there 20 million more people who have health insurance in America because of the Affordable Care Act, but also the fact is, the rate of increase in costs in health care has slowed down—slower than at any time in recent records or modern memory. It has extended the life of Medicare for another 12 or 13 years because the cost of health care is not rising as quickly as we thought it might.

The Republicans would take us back to the bad old days when the cost of health care was going up even more rapidly. I don't think most Americans would sign up for that.

We also understand that when it comes to the Affordable Care Act,

there are ways to improve it. I signed on to one of the provisions that Senator MCCONNELL took exception to this morning. It is a provision for us to consider a public option when it comes to health insurance. I am all for private health insurance companies competing, doing their best, trying to win the support and the enrollment of American families, but what is wrong with creating a Medicare-like proposal that is a not-for-profit entity providing health insurance along the style of Medicare?

Senator MCCONNELL was pretty critical of that this morning. He hadn't asked most Americans what they think about Medicare. He should. Many of them thank God we have it. For many of them, it meant health insurance when they had no place to turn. The creation of Medicare over 50 years ago was liberating to many seniors. Now they finally have affordable, quality health care after they retire. So putting that on as a public option to be considered by those who are signing up for health insurance would let them shop and let them compete. That to me is consistent with what we want to achieve when it comes to health care in this country.

So we listen time and again to these attacks and critiques of the Affordable Care Act. We have yet to see the Republican alternative. The only alternative they suggest is going back to the bad old days when health insurance cost too much, when health insurance discriminated against people with pre-existing conditions, and when health insurance was a gamble as to whether you would have it from this year to the next.

There are ways to improve the Affordable Care Act. I won't come to argue and will be the last to say that it is perfect as written, but in order to improve it, we need bipartisan cooperation, which we don't have. On the Republican side of the aisle, there have been 60 or 70 votes to abolish it, but not 1 vote to step up and try to improve it, which I would be happy to join in on a bipartisan basis. That is what the American people expect of us.

The last point I would like to make on the issue of health care is to state for the RECORD of the U.S. Senate that we had a meeting yesterday on medical research. This is a good news story, and there aren't a lot of them on Capitol Hill. But we moved forward on a bipartisan basis to make substantial increases in the medical research budgets of the National Institutes of Health. This is the premier medical research facility for the world, and we are lucky to have it right here in the Washington area.

Dr. Francis Collins heads it up. He told me years ago that if he could get 5-percent real growth in medical research for a number of years, we could make dramatic advances when it comes to medical research and cures for diseases. I took him up on that, and I enlisted a joint effort—first with PATTY MURRAY, my colleague from the

State of Washington, who is in a key position on the Appropriations Committee and the authorizing committee in the area of medical research and is totally committed to the effort, and on the Republican side Senator BLUNT of Missouri and Senator ALEXANDER of Tennessee. Then Senator LINDSEY GRAHAM of South Carolina joined me to co-chair the NIH Caucus.

Here are some things you may not know about medical research and how important it is. There was a briefing yesterday on diabetes. I didn't realize until I walked into that briefing that one-third of the annual expenditure for Medicare is for the treatment of diabetes. In addition to that, 20 percent of the annual expenditure for Medicare is for Alzheimer's. So for two diseases, diabetes and Alzheimer's, more than 50 percent of our Medicare budget is being spent each year. If we could develop new drugs, new treatments, new approaches that deal with diabetes and Alzheimer's, it would not only spare the people from the suffering they are going through and from the need for medical care, but it would greatly help our Medicare Program to be more solvent for years to come.

Is medical research a good investment? I think it is the best investment. We have seen it pay off over and over and over again. Do you remember not too long ago when we were talking about people who were making their last trek down to Plains, GA, in the hopes that they would see former President Jimmy Carter for the last time because of his cancer diagnosis? Then, do you remember when President Jimmy Carter held a press conference and said: I am cancer-free. It was because of the development of drugs and medical treatments through medical research. That has given him back his life. For many Americans, it is the same story every day.

We may do a lot of things wrong in Washington, but let's not get medical research wrong. Let's get it right. Let's make it bipartisan, and let's invest in it. I can't think of a better investment for future generations in this country.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. COTTON). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 17 minutes as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I am here for the 147th time in my series of speeches urging the Senate to wake up to the consequences of climate change and also to the motives of the outside forces that lull the Senate into persistent somnambulism.

Outside this Chamber, every major scientific society, every one that I know of, of my colleagues' home State universities, all of America's National Labs, our military and security professionals, and NOAA and NASA all agree on the basic science of climate change and broadly support responsible climate action. There may be uncertainty about exactly what year sea level rise will hit what floodmark, for instance, but on the basic idea that climate change is causing seas to rise and floods to come, it is game over.

NASA reported that August 2016 was the warmest August in 136 years of recordkeeping. August tied July as the hottest month the world has seen in the 136 years we have been measuring. More notable, August marked the 11th record-setting month in a row in NASA's data set. Why, in the face of all of that, does this Chamber slumber? Thank the dark influence of the fossil fuel industry.

For years, Big Oil and its allies funded outright denial of manmade climate change. The Union of Concerned Scientists issued this report last year: "The Climate Deception Dossiers: Internal Fossil Fuel Industry Memos Reveal Decades of Corporate Disinformation." The report documents how the big polluters contributed to front organizations and paid scientists to put out junk science contradicting what real, peer-reviewed science and even the industry's own experts knew about how burning fossil fuels affects the environment.

Take ExxonMobil, for example. According to the company's own documents, as recently as 2015, ExxonMobil was still funding organizations that promote climate science disinformation, including the American Legislative Exchange Council, which peddled legislation to State legislatures that included a finding that human-induced global warming "may lead to . . . possibly beneficial climatic changes."

At the Hoover Institution, a senior fellow, not a climate scientist, argued that climate data since 1880 supports a conclusion that it would take as long as 500 years to reach a 4-degree centigrade of global warming.

At the Manhattan Institute of Policy Research, a senior fellow writing about climate change said: "The science is not settled, not by a long shot."

The CEO of the so-called National Black Chamber of Commerce claimed that "there has been no global warming detected for the last 18 years." Tell that to NASA.

Let's not forget the Pacific Legal Foundation, where a senior attorney attacked EPA's authority to even regulate CO₂, in part because it is a "ubiquitous natural substance essential to life on Earth."

All of those pronouncements by Exxon-backed organizations, as reports in both InsideClimate News and the Los Angeles Times have confirmed, run counter to what real scientists know.

Yet, according to the public affairs guy at ExxonMobil, the company has supported mainstream climate science for decades. Their PR guy said: "Frankly, we made the call that we needed to back away from supporting the groups that were undercutting the actual risk" of climate change. Well, that doesn't actually seem to be true.

ExxonMobil's campaign of falsehoods has the attention of several attorneys general, and in today's newspaper, it is revealed that it also has the attention of the Securities and Exchange Commission. Their questions are not unreasonable: Is ExxonMobil actively advancing the notion that its products have little or no effect on the Earth's environment, while at the same time suppressing its own internal research on the effects of carbon pollution, deceiving consumers into buying ExxonMobil products based on false claims? Is the company misleading its investors about its developable oil reserves and long-term prospects in a climate-changed world? It breaks the law to knowingly mislead consumers and shareholders about something material, and climate change is certainly material to ExxonMobil.

As Senator WARREN and I recently wrote in the Washington Post, investigations by States attorneys general are making ExxonMobil nervous, and their Republican friends in Congress are riding to the rescue. House Science, Space, and Technology Committee chairman LAMAR SMITH and his fellow committee Republicans have issued subpoenas demanding that the attorneys general fork over all materials relating to their investigations.

I asked the Congressional Research Service, and as far as they could find, no committee has ever subpoenaed documents in an ongoing State AG investigation.

Setting aside the federalism problem of Congress going after States in a sovereign State function, if they tried this stuff with our Federal Attorney General, they would be rebuffed.

The committee subpoenas also targeted eight organizations, including the Union of Concerned Scientists, the Rockefeller Family Fund, and Greenpeace, ordering them to turn over their internal communications related to what Chairman SMITH describes as "coordinated efforts to deprive ExxonMobil of its First Amendment rights."

Take a moment to absorb that. States attorneys general are investigating whether a fraud has been committed—something State AGs do every day. As Rhode Island's AG, that is what I did. Sometimes we would uncover fraud and sometimes not. Ultimately, if the evidence warranted it and if the attorney general pursued the case to trial, the question of fraud would be resolved in open court.

Instead of praising the State AGs for doing their jobs within our system of checks and balances, congressional Republicans have leapt in to obstruct the

investigation before any evidence becomes public. So far, both the subpoenaed attorneys general and the eight organizations have refused to comply with those subpoenas. I say, good for them. If the committee moves to enforce its subpoenas, the matter will then come before a judge. If that happens, I hope those attorneys general will question whether the committee subpoenas reflect a legitimate governmental effort or are issued on behalf of a private party—indeed, the very private party which is the subject of those attorney general investigations. The law is clear that a legislative committee may pursue even an unworthy legislative purpose, but it is not clear that a legislative committee can lend itself to a private party. Let the court determine whether the House committee is acting as the de facto agent of ExxonMobil.

What might that court consider? Well, first, this is a committee whose chairman has received nearly \$685,000 in campaign contributions since 1989 from the oil and gas industry. The remaining committee majority have received over \$2.9 million in campaign contributions. I expect that is admissible evidence.

What else might the court consider? The committee asserts ExxonMobil has a First Amendment right that it needs to step in to protect. Interestingly, the shoe has been on the other foot when an attorney general of Virginia was tormenting a climate scientist—indeed, tormenting him so badly that the University of Virginia took that attorney general all the way to the Virginia Supreme Court to make him stop. The committee took no interest in that. Theirs is a First Amendment concern that only surfaces when the fossil fuel industry is the subject of investigation.

What else might the court consider? How about that the entire First Amendment argument the committee makes is a crock. Ken Kimmell, president of the Union of Concerned Scientists, noted that the committee "makes no allegation that UCS violated any laws or regulations, and [the] claim, that providing information to attorneys general infringes on ExxonMobil's rights, is nonsense." Mr. Kimmell is right. It is well-established law that there is a clear line between fraud and First Amendment-protected speech. The dean of the Yale Law School has published an article explaining this. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From The Washington Post, June 24, 2016]

EXXON-MOBIL IS ABUSING THE FIRST AMENDMENT

(By Robert Post)

Global warming is perhaps the single most significant threat facing the future of humanity on this planet. It is likely to wreak havoc on the economy, including, most especially, on the stocks of companies that sell

hydrocarbon energy products. If large oil companies have deliberately misinformed investors about their knowledge of global warming, they may have committed serious commercial fraud.

A potentially analogous instance of fraud occurred when tobacco companies were found to have deliberately misled their customers about the dangers of smoking. The safety of nicotine was at the time fiercely debated, just as the threat of global warming is now vigorously contested. Because tobacco companies were found to have known about the risks of smoking, even as they sought to convince their customers otherwise, they were held liable for fraud. Despite the efforts of tobacco companies to invoke First Amendment protections for their contributions to public debate, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit found: "Of course it is well settled that the First Amendment does not protect fraud."

The point is a simple one. If large corporations were free to mislead deliberately the consuming public, we would live in a jungle rather than in an orderly and stable market.

ExxonMobil and its supporters are now eliding the essential difference between fraud and public debate. Raising the revered flag of the First Amendment, they loudly object to investigations recently announced by attorneys general of several states into whether ExxonMobil has publicly misrepresented what it knew about global warming.

The National Review has accused the attorneys general of "trampling the First Amendment." Post columnist George F. Will has written that the investigations illustrate the "authoritarianism" implicit in progressivism, which seeks "to criminalize debate about science." And Hans A. von Spakovsky, speaking for the Heritage Foundation, compared the attorneys general to the Spanish Inquisition.

Despite their vitriol, these denunciations are wide of the mark. If your pharmacist sells you patent medicine on the basis of his "scientific theory" that it will cure your cancer, the government does not act like the Spanish Inquisition when it holds the pharmacist accountable for fraud.

The obvious point, which remarkably bears repeating, is that there are circumstances when scientific theories must remain open and subject to challenge, and there are circumstances when the government must act to protect the integrity of the market, even if it requires determining the truth or falsity of those theories. Public debate must be protected, but fraud must also be suppressed. Fraud is especially egregious because it is committed when a seller does not himself believe the hokum he foists on an unwitting public.

One would think conservative intellectuals would be the first to recognize the necessity of prohibiting fraud so as to ensure the integrity of otherwise free markets. Prohibitions on fraud go back to Roman times; no sane market could exist without them.

It may be that after investigation the attorneys general do not find evidence that ExxonMobil has committed fraud. I do not prejudice the question. The investigation is now entering its discovery phase, which means it is gathering evidence to determine whether fraud has actually been committed.

Nevertheless, ExxonMobil and its defenders are already objecting to the subpoena by the attorneys general, on the grounds that it "amounts to an impermissible content-based restriction on speech" because its effect is to "deter ExxonMobil from participating in the public debate over climate change now and in the future." It is hard to exaggerate the brazen audacity of this argument.

If ExxonMobil has committed fraud, its speech would not merit First Amendment

protection. But the company nevertheless invokes the First Amendment to suppress a subpoena designed to produce the information necessary to determine whether ExxonMobil has committed fraud. It thus seeks to foreclose the very process by which our legal system acquires the evidence necessary to determine whether fraud has been committed. In effect, the company seeks to use the First Amendment to prevent any informed lawsuit for fraud.

But if the First Amendment does not prevent lawsuits for fraud, it does not prevent subpoenas designed to provide evidence necessary to establish fraud. That is why when a libel plaintiff sought to inquire into the editorial processes of CBS News and CBS raised First Amendment objections analogous to those of ExxonMobil, the Supreme Court in the 1979 case *Herbert v. Lando* unequivocally held that the Constitution does not preclude ordinary discovery of information relevant to a lawsuit, even with respect to a defendant news organization.

The attorneys general are not private plaintiffs. They represent governments, and the Supreme Court has always and rightfully been extremely reluctant to question the good faith of prosecutors when they seek to acquire information necessary to pursue their official obligations. If every prosecutorial request for information could be transformed into a constitutional attack on a defendant's point of view, law enforcement in this country would grind to a halt. Imagine the consequences in prosecutions against terrorists, who explicitly seek to advance a political ideology.

It is grossly irresponsible to invoke the First Amendment in such contexts. But we are witnessing an increasing tendency to use the First Amendment to unravel ordinary business regulations. This is heartbreaking at a time when we need a strong First Amendment for more important democratic purposes than using a constitutional noose to strangle basic economic regulation.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. As the attorney general of New York correctly states, "Fraud is not protected by the First Amendment."

A number of high-profile legal scholars sent a letter last week to Chairman SMITH, condemning the subpoenas as "misguided." The letter argues that the subpoenas are "invalid and constitutionally impermissible." It turns out, according to these scholars, that the First Amendment actually works the other way:

The Subpoenas, and the threat of future sanctions, themselves threaten the First Amendment—directly inhibiting the rights of their recipients to speak, to associate and to petition state officials without interference from Congress.

A copy of the legal scholars' letter to Chairman SMITH can be accessed at the Yale Law School website at <http://tinyurl.com/yaleletter>.

Rhode Island attorney general Peter Kilmartin and his colleagues have also urged Chairman SMITH to withdraw the subpoenas. "Your interference in our colleagues' work ignores a 'vital consideration' under our constitutional system of dual sovereignty; the preservation of comity between the federal government and the states."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the Attorney General's letter to Chairman SMITH be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF MARYLAND,
OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Baltimore, MD, August 11, 2016.

Hon. LAMAR SMITH,
Chairman, Committee on Science, Space and
Technology, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN SMITH: We write to express our profound concern with the subpoenas issued on July 13, 2016 to our colleagues, the attorneys general of Massachusetts and New York. Through these subpoenas, which we understand you issued without a vote of the Committee, you seek the production of materials developed by the attorneys general in the course of their ongoing respective investigations of potential violations by the ExxonMobil Corporation of state securities and consumer protection laws. You have framed this intervention as "vigorous oversight" of state attorneys general and their investigative work. Such oversight would exceed Congress' constitutional authority, and the July 13 subpoenas should therefore be withdrawn.

Your interference in our colleagues' work ignores a "vital consideration" under our constitutional system of dual sovereignty: the preservation of comity between the federal government and the states. See *Younger v. Harris*, 401 U.S. 37, 44-45 (1971). "Comity," Justice Black wrote for the Supreme Court in *Younger*, means "a proper respect for state functions, a recognition of the fact that the entire country is made up of a Union of separate state governments, and a continuance of the belief that the National Government will fare best if the States and their institutions are left free to perform their separate functions in their separate ways." *Id.* Any claim of a congressional right to "oversee" the work of state constitutional law enforcement officers in fulfilling their core responsibilities under state law disrupts this comity and tears at the essential fabric of our national Constitution.

As attorneys general, we each hold offices established in our states' constitutions or statutes. Our offices are critical to the functioning of our states' governments, and they have deep historical roots. Some of us, like the attorneys general of Massachusetts and New York, hold offices whose origins precede the founding of our country. The state attorney general has been described by the Florida courts, for example, as "the attorney and legal guardian of the people. . . . His duties pertain to the Executive Department of the State, and it is his duty to use means most effectual to the enforcement of the laws, and the protection of the people, whenever directed by the proper authority, or when occasion arises." *State of Florida v. Exxon Corp.*, 526 F.2d 266, 270 (5th Cir. 1976) (quoting *Attorney General v. Gleason*, 12 Fla. 190, 212 (Fla. 1868)) (holding that Attorney General of Florida had legal authority to pursue federal antitrust action against Exxon and other oil companies without authorization of government agencies allegedly injured by conduct at issue). Several state supreme courts, recognizing the broad discretion conferred on state attorneys general by state constitutions, have aptly described the office of attorney general as a "public trust." See, e.g., *Gleason*, 12 Fla. at 214; *Attorney General v. Morita*, 41 Haw. 1, 15 (Haw. Terr. 1955); *Commonwealth v. Burrell*, 7 Pa. 34, 39 (1847).

In fulfilling this public trust, we are each accountable in multiple ways to the people of our states. Most of us were elected directly to our offices by the people we serve. State legislatures write and enact most of the laws that our offices enforce, including securities and consumer protection laws like

the ones that give rise to the investigations in New York and Massachusetts that you have proposed to “oversee.” Moreover, we are accountable to the courts of our states, which, on innumerable occasions over the course of our states’ histories, have ruled both for and against us and our predecessors on issues of federal and state constitutional law, on issues of statutory interpretation, and on other issues.

“[O]ur Constitution establishes a system of dual sovereignty between the States and the Federal Government.” *Gregory v. Ashcroft*, 501 U.S. 452, 457 (1991). Under that system, the federal government is one of limited powers, and, under the Tenth Amendment, “[t]he powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.” It is fundamental to our system of dual sovereignty that, as the Supreme Court has said, “States are not mere political subdivisions of the United States.” *New York v. United States*, 505 U.S. 144, 188 (1992). Indeed, “State governments are neither regional offices nor administrative agencies of the Federal Government. The positions occupied by state officials appear nowhere on the Federal Government’s most detailed organizational chart. The Constitution instead ‘leaves to the several States a residuary and inviolable sovereignty.’” *Id.* (quoting *The Federalist* No. 39).

In light of our nation’s commitment to the preservation of a system of dual sovereignty, it is not surprising that, despite centuries of investigative and prosecutorial activity by state attorneys general in which constitutional objections have been raised, you have not identified a single valid precedent, from any period of our country’s history, for the “vigorous oversight” of state attorneys general that you are now proposing to undertake. Difficult enough are cases where Congress proposes to regulate subject matters arguably reserved to the states, and where there may be some analytical difficulty entailed in drawing “distinction[s] between what is truly national, and what is truly local.” *United States v. Morrison*, 529 U.S. 598, 617 (2000). Your investigation, though, would go further. The stated purpose of your investigation is to oversee state constitutional officers themselves and the manner in which they fulfill their responsibilities under state law. Who oversees state officials is a matter “of the most fundamental sort for a sovereign entity,” because it is “through the structure of its government” that “a State defines itself as sovereign.” *Gregory v. Ashcroft*, 501 U.S. at 460 (holding that Congress could not, through laws prohibiting age discrimination, regulate the retirement age for state judges). Our national Constitution and our respective states’ constitutions neither anticipate nor tolerate a structure under which Congress arrogates to itself the authority to oversee investigations conducted by state attorneys general.

Your proposed “vigorous oversight” does not merely interfere with our work and the work of our colleagues. You also purport to supplant the role of state legislatures and state courts. We cannot understand on what basis you seem to assume, for example, that state courts in Massachusetts will be unable to resolve the constitutional objections that ExxonMobil, through skilled counsel, has already lodged there. State courts, not Congress, are the appropriate arbiters of any state law claims brought by the attorneys general of Massachusetts and New York against ExxonMobil and of any constitutional objections that ExxonMobil might assert.

The Constitution establishes “a system in which there is sensitivity to the legitimate

interests of both State and National Governments, and in which the National Government, anxious though it may be to vindicate and protect federal rights and federal interests, always endeavors to do so in ways that will not unduly interfere with the legitimate activities of the States.” *Younger*, 401 U.S. at 44. Your proposed oversight of state constitutional officers cannot be squared with these essential principles of federalism, nor can your attempt to oversee the resolution of alleged constitutional issues arising from the ongoing investigative activities of state attorneys general undertaken under state law. We therefore urge you to withdraw your subpoenas, refrain from attempting to exercise further oversight, and allow state attorneys general and state courts to perform their constitutionally prescribed roles.

Sincerely,

Brian E. Frosh, Maryland Attorney General; George Jepsen, Connecticut Attorney General; Douglas Chin, Hawaii Attorney General; Jim Hood, Mississippi Attorney General; Peter F. Kilmartin, Rhode Island Attorney General; Kamala D. Harris, California Attorney General; Karl A. Racine, District of Columbia Attorney General; Janet T. Mills, Maine Attorney General; Ellen F. Rosenblum, Oregon Attorney General; William H. Sorrell, Vermont Attorney General; Mark R. Herring, Virginia Attorney General; Bob Ferguson, Washington Attorney General.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Congressional investigations and hearings have a unique ability to focus a nation’s attention and bring facts of public importance to light. These subpoenas, however, appear intended to impede lawful State investigations. They do not advance the First Amendment, they trample on it.

Senator WARREN and I offered a suggestion to the House committee in our Washington Post piece:

If this House Committee is so concerned about the First Amendment rights of ExxonMobil, call a hearing, invite ExxonMobil executives to testify, and give them the opportunity to speak. What better way to protect a person’s right to speak freely than to give that person a forum to speak, right here in Congress?

They can come in, say whatever they want to say, and answer questions. I know I would love to hear what they have to say.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

TRIBUTE TO DAVID DOSS AND NICOLE HEBERT

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, I rise to honor two of my longest serving staff members who have been tremendous team leaders in our office: David Doss, my State director, and Nicole Hebert, my deputy State director. They are both, sadly, departing the Senate later this month to start exciting new careers.

Nicole Hebert started with our team when I was first running for the U.S. Senate in 2004. Nicole is a Lafayette native and a native of the Acadiana region—or, Cajun country, as it is known—which was a key battleground in our election in 2004, in part because we were running against a local Cajun candidate in our jungle primary who

was supported by my predecessor who was also from Acadiana. With Nicole’s help, we shocked the entire State that year, winning with over 50 percent of the vote in the primary, forgoing the need for any runoff and winning Acadiana against a Cajun candidate—and Nicole was a big, important part of that victory.

Nicole and her husband Tommy and Nicole’s parents Lynne and Joey Durel were all incredibly helpful then and ever since then in helping me navigate the region and have always made—as a guy from southeast Louisiana—feel right at home in that important part of the State.

Nicole, Tommy, and Lynne have all been on my staff at one point or another, and all of them were just great at helping me loosen up, take off my tie, and relax. They were also great at helping explain the Boudreaux and Thibodaux jokes that everyone was laughing so hard at and I could barely even understand them.

In Acadiana politics, you are nobody unless you are invited to a supper hosted by somebody named Trey, T-boy—or something like that, and I can’t even count how many of those informal suppers I have been to and enjoyed with Nicole and her family. I will tell you, I have experienced some of the best food in the world at those great events—boudin, crawfish pie, etouffe, and alligator sauce piquante—and, of course, all the festivals in Acadiana. I have been on so many pickup trucks and firetrucks—including an infamous one that broke down in the mud—for all of those Acadiana festivals: the Rice Festival, the Sugar Festival, the Frog Festival, the Crawfish Festival, and the Shrimp and Petroleum Festival. The fun list goes on and on.

Even though it is technically work, I certainly enjoyed all that time with Nicole and the Hebert family, and often found myself with a stomach cramp when I left the region, not because I ate or drank too much—although that happened too—but because I was always laughing so hard in their company.

Nicole and Tommy, their parents, and their two girls Hannah and Meredith, whom I have really enjoyed watching grow up, have all been a huge part of our Vitter family life. Wendy and I count them as dear friends, and we certainly will keep up with them through the rest of our lives.

David Doss, our State director, was one of my earliest hires when I was first elected to the U.S. House. He is my State director and before that served as my district director in the U.S. House. I know all of our colleagues here can attest to the fact that having a great State director on top of things, really managing the State offices properly, is a key element of success in any Senate office.

State directors are on the frontlines of everything. They always have to know what is on constituents’ minds

and what is happening around the State, and David has proven one of the great State directors in the country.

We have dealt with more than our share of disasters in Louisiana, and there is no one else I would have guiding our office through all that than David. Following Katrina, he organized a mobile office so our State staff could get around to impacted areas. That continued following other disasters. After the BP oilspill, David organized an incredibly effective and efficient casework operation to help assist people with those important claims.

David does it all. He has never been above any task, from seeing casework all the way through to the best possible outcome, to answering phones, to sorting through the mail when necessary, even to helping drive and getting me around the State.

David manages our seven State offices—which, by the way, is more than any other Senator from our State has ever had. We have an office in the seven biggest metropolitan locations around the State. So that is no easy task for him to manage. He has to coordinate our staff's driving schedule from New Orleans to Lake Charles, to Shreveport, to Monroe—all that in the same day sometimes—to get me to every parish, every Congress, for town-hall meetings, a pledge I made when I first ran for the Senate in 2004.

Others have chosen to fly on private jets to get around the State, but David always organized for us to drive each leg of each journey to save taxpayer dollars and so we can see what is really happening on the ground in every parish of our great State. Sometimes David would be doing that driving himself.

There was one time, of course, when we had to take away David's driving privileges for a while after he backed into a street sign with me in the car, but don't worry, no injuries—except possibly to David's pride for a while. Other than that minor accident, I would describe David's leadership of our State staff as really steady—a great leading, guiding influence, always a steady hand, always has an open line of communication, always listens well, always leads with that reassuring, steady hand.

There are very few community meetings, ribbon cuttings, or luncheons, or events all around our State where we don't have our State staff in attendance, and David has really helped build and run that well-oiled State staff machine and that well-oiled constituent service machine.

I have often said, the most fulfilling parts of my career are the relationships and friendships Wendy and I have built, including with our great staff. Wendy and I often consider staff an extension of our family. That is absolutely true for David and his wife Anne Mary and their daughters Julie and Jennifer.

We wish them all the best as they start an exciting part of their lives. I

thank Nicole and David for their wonderful service to Louisiana and for their friendship. We wish them all the best again as they start new parts of their careers. They are great individuals, they are great team leaders, and they are also great representatives of a wonderful State staff.

I mentioned before we have seven offices around Louisiana. Each office has a strong presence in their regions and their communities. I think our State staff, in that presence, has created the gold standard for constituent service, in part because of David and Nicole's leadership, but we have also built a great team, without exception, in all seven of those offices. To me, success in Congress is not measured by how many bills or amendments you introduce or pass but how many people you help and impact in a positive way. And our staff has countless success stories through their important casework—really important casework wins—which sometimes actually changes people's lives in a major way for the better. It is because of this gold standard that our great State staff has developed that we decided to memorialize what we have collected as best practices in terms of constituent service. We are putting that into a guidebook related to constituent service, and I will be sending that guidebook to all of the major candidates who are running to fill this Senate seat. In the guidebook, we will go through those best practices on constituent casework, on helping people and organizations in the State navigate the Federal process applying for grants and the like. As to the important need of being open and accessible, how a Senate office can do that effectively, and maintaining constant lines of communication with our fellow Louisiana citizens, all of those best practices and good ideas will be going into this guidebook that will be available to my successor.

Again, I want to thank David and Nicole and our entire State staff team for their years of dedicated service and success serving, really going above and beyond in serving the people of Louisiana.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SULLIVAN). The Senator from Nebraska.

THE ECONOMY

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, I rise today to call attention to a very troubling issue, and we hear about it often. Sadly, there is a lack of leadership from the executive branch with regard to it. I am talking about the state of the American economy. Many families across Nebraska and across our Nation are worried. Whether they are hard-working parents trying to make ends meet or grandparents who are concerned about their grandchildren's future, there is no shortage of anxiety.

As many of my colleagues have pointed out, the economy is not recovering quickly enough. In fact, we are slogging through the slowest economic recovery since the 1960s. By way of ref-

erence, in 1961 Kennedy was President, a gallon of gas cost 31 cents, and Roy Orbison was in Billboard's top five.

In every economic recovery since that time, the American economy grew an average of 3.7 percent per year. Since 2009, however, this growth has averaged a mere 2.1 percent per year. This year, it slowed to just 1 percent. Last quarter, the economy grew by a pitiful 1.2 percent. Again, things are not getting better quickly enough.

There are some real obstacles before us. The share of Americans in the workforce has fallen below 63 percent. That is nearly three percentage points below where we were when the recovery began. Another concern is the growing number of expensive and burdensome regulations. Rulemaking under the Obama administration has skyrocketed. Federal regulations cost an estimated \$1.9 trillion per year. That is more than \$15,000 for each American household. These figures are worrisome.

Here is one that should truly be frightening for us. At the same time, we have seen our national debt reach a staggering \$19.5 trillion. Just last year, the United States spent \$223 billion, or 6 percent of the Federal budget, to pay interest on that national debt. This year, the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office estimates that our deficit will be \$590 billion. This means that we are going to be spending almost \$600 billion more than we take in.

If we don't change course, the CBO estimates that these deficits are going to skyrocket over the next decade, reaching \$1 trillion in 2024, and they will only continue to grow from there. These numbers paint us a very dark picture, but I do have some good news. There is still time for us to change course. In fact, this body has taken several good steps.

Since taking office, I have worked with my colleagues to reduce some wasteful spending and some burdensome regulations. In 2015, I introduced the Grants Oversight and New Efficiency Act, or the GONE Act. This bill, which was signed into law in January, will save millions of dollars by closing expired grant accounts and increasing oversight over Federal grant programs.

I have also introduced and pushed for votes on several waste-cutting amendments during the appropriations process, including one to wind down an outdated and ineffective stimulus-era program. These are good steps, and here are a few others. We passed a highway bill, which will provide much needed certainty for States, businesses, families, and the traveling public. By prioritizing our infrastructure, we are investing in our economy's ability to grow.

In the same vein, last week, we passed the Water Resources Development Act. This is another key infrastructure bill that will enable our economy to grow by modernizing our ports and our waterways. So we do have tools available for us to meet these fiscal challenges.

We have to exercise restraint, and we have to exercise that restraint among ourselves. The appropriations process is a critical way for us to do this. It is the only way that our citizens can truly hold their elected representatives accountable for this spending. It allows the American people to see the true priorities of their elected representatives.

There is one last point before I close. Reducing the national debt does not mean that we stop investing. It simply forces us to make smarter choices. Some things we need to prioritize, and we know what those are. We need to keep our families and our communities safe. We must invest in infrastructure to promote commerce and grow this economy. We must reduce wasteful spending and prioritize prudent spending. We must reduce the national debt. We must get government out of the way so opportunities can be created for our families and for our young people, but we have to be responsible stewards of taxpayer money. We must make those responsible choices.

I believe that our very best days as a nation are before us, and that is because of my unwavering faith in the fundamental goodness, tenacity, and the creativity of the American people. 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.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MOTION TO DISCHARGE—S.J. RES.
39

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, on behalf of Senator PAUL and pursuant to the Arms Export Control Act of 1976, I move to discharge the Foreign Relations Committee from further consideration of S.J. Res. 39, relating to the disapproval of the proposed foreign military sale to the Government of Saudi Arabia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is now pending.

Under the previous order, there will be 3 hours of debate on the motion, divided between the proponents and opponents, with the Senator from Kentucky controlling 30 minutes of proponent time and the Senator from Connecticut controlling 15 minutes of proponent time.

The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time during quorum calls on the motion be equally divided between the proponents and the opponents.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I am going to speak briefly in support of the resolution. Senator LEE, a cosponsor of this resolution, is on the floor, and he will speak after I do.

Let me say at the outset that I believe in a strong U.S. global presence. I

believe the United States is at its best when it is a global leader. We can and we should be a force for good and for peace in the world.

I also believe, quite frankly, that peace comes through strength. I don't apologize for the size of our military budget, nor do I think it would be wise for this Congress to give up this country's massive military edge over every global adversary and friend. Having the world's biggest, baddest military keeps us safe, and, frankly, it keeps a lot of our friends safe as well.

My last stipulation before I talk about the resolution would be this: I also believe there are times when we should use that military power. There are times when war or military action is just. If you want to provide safe harbor for terrorists who plan a massive attack against this country, such as the Taliban in Afghanistan, then they can expect a visit from the U.S. Army.

But increasingly we all have to reconcile with the fact that there are more and more limitations on the effectiveness of U.S. military power. Today, our adversaries and our enemies practice something we call asymmetric warfare, which means they concede our conventional military advantage and use other means and methods to exert power and project strength. China does it through economic aid, Russia does it through bribery and the extension of its natural resources to its neighbors, and ISIL does it through terror and through the perversion of religion. Yet this country and this Congress continue to believe that most conflicts around the globe can be solved with just a little bit more American military hardware.

That is what brings us here today to talk about this arms sale to Saudi Arabia, particularly in the context of the ongoing conflict inside Yemen—a civil war inside Yemen in which the United States has become a participant.

This is a picture from war-ravaged Yemen—an ongoing humanitarian disaster. We don't have the full extent of the numbers, but there have already been thousands of civilians killed. If we talk to Yemenis, they will tell us that this is perceived inside Yemen as not a Saudi-led bombing campaign, which it is broadly advertised as in the newspapers, but as a U.S. bombing campaign or, at best, a U.S.-Saudi bombing campaign.

There is a U.S. imprint on every civilian death inside Yemen which is radicalizing the people of this country against the United States. Why is this? Well, it is because, while the conflict inside Yemen started as a civil war—the Houthis overrunning the government inside Sana'a—the Saudis and a coalition of other Gulf States have entered the conflict, largely through air operations, to try to push the Houthis back, and they have asked for our assistance, which we have given, and we have given it in substantial means and methods. We provide the bombs, we provide the refueling planes, and we provide the intelligence. There really is no way this bombing campaign could happen without U.S. participation.

The United States is at war in Yemen today. The United States is at war in Yemen today, and this Congress has not debated that engagement. This Congress has not debated that war. It is yet another unauthorized U.S. military engagement overseas.

But the scope of this disaster for the purposes of U.S. security interests is not just the radicalization of the Yemen people against the United States or the thousands of people who have been killed but also the fact that this war has given ground—an opportunity for Al Qaeda and ISIS to grow—grow by leaps and bounds.

Let's be honest. Our first responsibility here is to protect this country from attack, and the most likely arm of Al Qaeda that would have the means or the inclination to attack the United States is the branch that exists inside Yemen. Their recruitment has grown by multiples over the course of this conflict. For a period of time, AQAP was able to use this conflict to grab control of a major port city inside Yemen, which radically changed the ability of AQAP to recruit and to grow their capacity to do harm outside of Yemen, because they had control of resources and taxation inside this city.

One would think that if the United States was providing all of these resources to the Saudi-led coalition, that some of them would be used to try to push back on ISIS's growth or AQAP's growth inside Yemen, but the exact opposite has happened. None of the Saudi bombs are dropping on AQAP; they are all dropping on Houthi targets and civilian targets. So we are arming the Saudis to fight an enemy—the Houthis—whom we have not declared war against, and the Saudis are not using those weapons to fight our sworn enemy whom we have declared war against: Al Qaeda. So the civilian casualties mount, ISIS and Al Qaeda grow, yet this is the first time we have had the opportunity to discuss the wisdom of this engagement.

We begged the Saudis to change their conduct. We have asked them to target Al Qaeda. To the extent that Al Qaeda is shrinking a bit, it is not because the Saudis have targeted them, it is because other players in the region—the Emirates—have targeted them. We begged the Saudis to stop bombing civilians. Yet in a 72-hour period earlier this summer, the Saudi-led coalition bombed another Doctors Without Borders facility, a school, and the principal's house next door. We give them targets that they should stay away from because they are key parts of routes to bring humanitarian relief in a country that is ravaged by famine, and they still hit those targets even after we told them to stay away. We begged the Saudis to change their behavior inside this war, and they haven't listened.

But it is not the only time they haven't listened. The fact is, if you are serious about stopping the flow of extremist recruiting across this globe, then you have to be serious about the very real fact that the Wahhabi-Salafist branch of Islam that is spread around the world by Saudi Arabia and their Wahhabi allies is part of the problem.

In 1956, there were 244 madrassas in Pakistan; today there are over 24,000. These schools are multiplying all over the globe. Conservative Salafist imams and mosques are spreading all across the world. Don't get me wrong, these schools and Mosques by and large don't teach violence directly. They aren't the minor leagues for Al Qaeda and ISIS, but they do teach a version of Islam that leads very nicely into an anti-Shia, anti-western militancy. We begged the Saudis to stop setting up these conservative Wahhabi operations in parts of the Middle East, in the Balkans, in Indonesia. Again, they haven't listened.

Just take the example of Kosovo. Kosovo 10 years ago would never have been a place that ISIS would have gone to recruit people into the fight inside Syria, but today it is one of the hotbeds of recruitment. It is not a coincidence that during the same period of time the Saudis and Wahhabis spent millions of dollars there, trying to convert Muslims to their brand of religion—a brand of religion that essentially says that everybody who doesn't believe what we believe is an infidel, that the crusades never ended, and that the obligation of a true Muslim is to find a way to fight back against any brand of the religion that doesn't match ours.

So for those who are going to vote for this arms sale, who are essentially going to endorse our current state of the relationship with Saudi Arabia and our Gulf State allies, just ask yourselves if we can really defeat terrorism if we remain silent on the primary progenitor of this brand of Islam that feeds into extremism. How can you say you are serious about strangling ISIL when the textbooks that are produced inside Saudi Arabia are the very same textbooks that are handed out to recruit suicide bombers?

If we really want to cut off extremism at its source, then we can't keep closing our eyes to the money that flows out of Saudi Arabia and the Gulf States into this conservative Salafist missionary movement around the world.

This arms sale is relevant to both of these questions—changing the war inside Yemen and sending a message that this export of the building blocks of extremism cannot continue. Why? Because the main part of this arms sale is a replacement of battle-damaged tanks—tanks that were likely in part damaged in the conduct of this war. It represents a piece of a very long ramp-up of arms sales into Saudi Arabia.

The numbers are pretty staggering. This administration has sold about six

to eight times the number of arms to Saudi Arabia than the last administration did, and the Saudis do listen. They do pay attention to what we say here. They don't like the fact that there are Republicans and Democrats critiquing this relationship. They will not like the fact that there will be votes against this arms sale. So even if it ultimately doesn't become law—which is unlikely, given the fact that even if it passes, the President could veto it—this could impact both of these questions, the conduct of the war in Yemen and the conduct of the export of Wahhabism around the globe.

Lastly, let me make the case that rejecting or voting against this arms sale is not going to end or even permanently damage our relationship with Saudi Arabia. We are allies. We will continue to be allies. Our common bond was forged during the Cold War when American and Saudi leaders found common ground in the fight against communism. The Saudis helped ensure that the Russians never got a meaningful foothold in the Middle East. Today, this unofficial detente that exists between Sunni nations and Israel in the region is part of the product of Saudi-led diplomacy. There have been many high-profile examples of deep U.S.-Saudi cooperation in the fight against ISIL and Al Qaeda, notwithstanding these critiques. More generally, our partnership with Saudi Arabia, the most powerful and richest country in the Arab world is an important bridge to the Islamic community—a testament to the fact that we can seek cooperation and engagement with governments in the Middle East and people worldwide, which is a direct rebuttal to this idea the terrorists spread that asserts we are at war with Islam.

This is not an either-or question, but we are strategic allies, which is different from being a values-based alliance. That means that when our strategic goals occasionally depart from one another, then we shouldn't be obligated to continue our cooperation on that particular front. The Saudis' guiding foreign policy goal is to gain regional supremacy over Iran. We certainly prefer a Middle East with more Saudi friends than Iranian friends; there should be no doubt about that. But our guiding foreign policy goal in that region is not for the Saudis to win the broadening proxy war with Iran; it is to protect our country from attack by terrorist groups that are metastasizing in Syria, Iraq, and now at worrying rates inside Yemen.

Today, our participation in the war inside Yemen is making us more vulnerable by attacks from AQAP and ISIS, not less vulnerable. Our bombs, our intelligence, our spotters, and our refueling planes are certainly helping the Saudis project power in the region, but it is fueling an arms race between Shia and Sunni nations that has no logical end other than mutual destruction, increasing chaos, and more un-

governable space for groups that want to attack the United States.

Said another way, is this really the right moment for the United States to be sending record numbers of arms into the Middle East?

Do we have any evidence from past conflicts in Afghanistan or the Iran and Iraq wars that more U.S. weapons end up in less, rather than more, bloodshed—an abbreviated rather than an elongated war?

It is time for the United States to press pause on our arms sales to Saudi Arabia. Let's make sure that the war in Yemen doesn't continue to spiral downward, jeopardizing U.S. national security interests. Let's press the Saudis to get serious about spending more time as firefighters and less time as arsonists, as they say, in the global fight against terrorism.

Let's ask ourselves whether we are comfortable with the United States getting slowly, predictably, and all too quietly dragged into yet another war in the Middle East. What will it take for this country to learn its lesson?

I thank the Presiding Officer and the body for the time, and I yield back.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

MR. FRANKEN. Mr. President, I thank Senator MURPHY, Senator PAUL, and Senator LEE for their leadership on this very important issue.

Since the Saudi-led coalition started a bombing campaign in Yemen in 2015, there has been an average of 13 civilian casualties each day, according to the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights. This means that thousands of civilians have been killed or wounded in the U.S.-backed war in Yemen. This is unacceptable. People all across this country have been outraged at how the Saudis have conducted this war and believe that the United States should not acquiesce or support such conduct.

Over the last decade, the United States has sold the Saudis over \$100 billion in arms. The United States has also supported the Saudi-led coalition with air-to-air refueling sorties, intelligence sharing, and military advisory assistance. That kind of support should not go along with acceptance of the Saudi disregard for innocent human lives and innocent civilian lives.

The legislation we will be voting on later today is a disapproval resolution regarding a \$1.15 billion arms sale. The very fact that we are voting on it today sends a very important message to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia that we are watching their actions closely and that the United States is not going to turn a blind eye to the indiscriminate killing of men, women, and children.

Again, I would like to thank Senators MURPHY, PAUL, and LEE for their leadership, and I urge my colleagues to support this important piece of legislation.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I rise today to lend my support and urge my colleagues to lend theirs to S.J. Res. 39, offered by my friend Senator RAND PAUL of Kentucky. The purpose of this particular resolution is to reconsider the billion-dollar arms sale between the United States and Saudi Arabia that was negotiated by the two governments earlier this year.

Under U.S. law, any arms sale approved by the State Department will go into effect within 30 days after that deal has been finalized, absent passage of a resolution of disapproval to prevent it from taking effect. That is exactly what Senator PAUL's resolution aims to do. If passed by the Senate and the House, the resolution would raise formal objections to the sale of \$1.15 billion worth of weapons and military equipment to the Government of Saudi Arabia.

Notice that there are Senators from both sides of the aisle working to pass this resolution of disapproval, supporting it in speeches and voting on it hopefully later today. It was introduced by a fellow Republican, and I am proud to join three of my Democratic colleagues as original cosponsors: Senator CHRIS MURPHY from Connecticut, from whom we heard just moments ago; Senator AL FRANKEN of Minnesota, from whom we heard after we heard from Senator MURPHY; and Senator MARTIN HEINRICH of New Mexico.

Some might call us strange bedfellows—two conservative Republicans and three liberal Democrats working together to achieve the same goal. But this observation misses the point entirely. Each one of us may have their own unique justification for supporting this resolution, but there is nothing strange about that; it simply proves that there are many reasons to consider and to reconsider this deal with Saudi Arabia.

One of those reasons and the basis for my support of Senator PAUL's resolution is that there is no conclusive evidence that the Saudi arms deal will in fact advance the strategic and security interests of the United States. In fact, there is evidence that points in the opposite direction. We know that Saudi Arabia is heavily involved in the civil war that is raging at this moment in Yemen—a conflict that has left a humanitarian crisis of staggering proportions in its wake and continues to do so. We know that the Saudi military will use the equipment included in this deal—everything from machine guns to grenade launchers to armored vehicles and tanks—to increase its own engagement in that seemingly intractable conflict. What we don't know is exactly how America's involvement in the civil war in Yemen serves our national security interests and protects the American people.

I have no problem in principle with the United States approving the sale of weapons and military equipment to

foreign governments when it is in our interest to do so. I certainly am not categorically opposed to selling arms to the Saudi Government. Saudi Arabia has long been an American ally in a very volatile region of the world, and I believe strengthening that alliance should be a priority for our foreign and military policy in the Middle East, but the fact that Saudi Arabia is an ally with whom we have a track record of selling arms is not in and of itself a sufficient reason to endorse this particular deal. It is not a reason that this deal should move through, should take effect without so much as a whimper from Members of Congress who might feel the need to raise possible concerns—concerns that relate to our own national security.

Yes, we want our allies to be strong. Yes, we want our allies to be capable of defending themselves. Yes, sometimes this means that we should offer them assistance in times of need. But the first and most fundamental responsibility of the U.S. Government is not to satisfy the requests of our allies reflexively, unflinchingly, and without asking acute questions; rather, the fundamental responsibility—the first job of the U.S. Government—is to protect the lives and liberties of the American people. That is where we need to be focused.

Now, the Government of Saudi Arabia clearly believes that intervening in this civil war in Yemen and participating in the decades-long sectarian conflict underlying that civil war in Yemen is in the best interest of the Saudi people. I don't doubt that, and it is not my place to question it, even if I did doubt it.

That is why the Saudi military has been fighting in Yemen since it first launched its intervention in March 2015. But can the same be said of the U.S. Government? Is intervening in this civil war a national priority for the American people? Is intervening in that civil war in our national security interest? Is it something that is going to make the American people safer?

Astoundingly, these are questions that have never been fully discussed and certainly have never been fully debated in this institution—an institution that likes to call itself and loves to be referred to as the world's greatest deliberative body.

This is more of an abdication of responsibility by Congress. It is more than just that. It is a national security hazard. It is not just that we are abdicating. It is not just that we are not doing something we are supposed to do. We are making things more dangerous than we need to.

The Framers of our Constitution gave important and exclusive foreign policy powers to the legislative branch because our Framers believed that the process of defining America's national interests and developing a foreign policy to pursue those interests must involve the participation of the people's representatives in Congress.

But alas, in recent years, Congress, in general, and the Senate, in particular, have happily taken a back seat to the executive branch in debating, developing, and defending to the public our Nation's foreign policy and grand strategy in the Middle East. That explains how it is possible that our military has actively supported the Saudi military's intervention in Yemen, including hundreds of air-to-air refueling sorties at a time when our military leaders unanimously contend that they are suffering from readiness and personnel shortfalls. It explains how it is possible that the U.S. military would be actively involved in the civil war in Yemen, even though many security experts point out that by supporting Saudi Arabia in Saudi Arabia's fight against the Houthis, we could be unintentionally assisting Al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula and ISIS affiliates in Yemen.

I urge my colleagues today to support this resolution of disapproval. Let us pause our intervention in this foreign conflict and show the country—show our country—that the legislative branch can fulfill its obligations to the American people faithfully, that we can openly and thoughtfully evaluate our interventions abroad, and that we are focused on protecting the security, safety, and interests of the American people above all others.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. ERNST). The majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, today the Senate will consider a motion to discharge a resolution of disapproval from the Foreign Relations Committee. I oppose that motion because I believe it would harm our Nation's long-term strategic interests in the Persian Gulf and in the broader Middle East.

It would further damage our alliance and our partnership with the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia at a time when our moderate Sunni Arab allies are questioning whether our Nation is able to meet our traditional commitment to the region. The resolution would also ignore the shared interests we have with Saudi Arabia in combating Al Qaeda and ISIS.

Were this resolution of disapproval ever to be adopted, it would further convince the world that the United States is retreating, not only from its commitments but also as the guarantor of the international order we worked to create after the Second World War.

I will move to table this motion and encourage all of my colleagues to support the motion. We are nearing the end of the Obama administration. The next President will have a stark choice upon assuming office—whether to continue the drawdown of America's conventional military power across the globe or to restore our warfighting capabilities to both renew our alliances and restore America to its position as the guarantor of the international security order.

After nearly 8 years, the President's approach to foreign policy has become all too clear—to end the war on terror, to draw down our conventional forces and capabilities, and to deploy special operations forces in economy-of-force train-and-assist missions across the globe.

The essence of this foreign policy was captured in his speech at West Point in May of 2014. In that speech, the President described a network of partnerships from South Asia to the Sahel, to be funded by a \$5 billion counterterrorism partnership fund for which Congress has yet to receive a viable plan. In those cases where indigenous forces prove insufficient and a need for direct action arises, the President announced his intention to resort to the use of armed unmanned aerial vehicles for strikes, as has been done in Yemen and Somalia.

So by deploying special operations forces for train-and-equip missions, the President hoped to manage the diffuse threat posed by Al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula, Boko Haram, terrorist networks inside of Libya that now threaten Egypt, the al-Nusra Front, the Taliban, ISIL, and other terrorist groups.

The concept of operations allowed the President to continue the force structure cuts to the conventional forces and sought to manage the threat from global terrorism. He envisioned no need to reverse the harmful damage of defense sequestration, to rebuild our conventional and nuclear forces, or to accept that leaving behind residual forces in Iraq and Afghanistan was a means by which this Nation preserves the strategic gains that we have made through sacrifice.

The threat of some of these Al Qaeda affiliates, associated groups, or independent terrorist organizations has outpaced the President's economy-of-force concept. In some cases, the host nation's military which we had trained and equipped had proven inadequate to defeat the insurgency in question, as was the case with AQAP, the Taliban, or ISIL.

The Obama administration never answered the question: What was to be done when the host nation's force we trained for counterterrorism was incapable of counterinsurgency—Iraq, Libya, Yemen? The efforts of the Department of Defense to train a moderate Syrian opposition never provided sufficient reasons for the President to rethink the basic strategy.

The President's concept of operations countenanced a persistent, enduring terrorist threat from AQAP, the Taliban, and other groups in those countries where insufficient ground combat power could be generated by the force that we trained.

In Riyadh, our traditional long-standing ally Saudi Arabia warned of Iran's efforts to arm and support Shia proxies in Syria, in Yemen, and in Lebanon and to foment unrest across the region, all of which was lost on the White House.

Instead, they were called "free riders," and Saudi Arabia's concerns with what a Muslim Brotherhood government in Cairo, instability in Libya, and the slaughter of Sunnis within Syria would mean for the region were completely ignored. The Obama administration has sounded an uncertain trumpet, but the words that resounded in Saudi Arabia and across the region were the commitment to our allies—that in negotiating with Iran to end its nuclear weapons program, no deal is better than a bad deal.

Well, this proved not to be true. The administration accepted the bad deal, and in its negotiation with Iran, the administration made concession after concession after concession: allowing Iran to retain a nuclear enrichment program, allowing for the retention of working centrifuges and a research and development program, providing financial relief and support, and lending legitimacy to the world's chief state sponsor of terror.

Under any net assessment, Iran has emerged from the nuclear deal with the Obama administration stronger—stronger than before the deal. The funds derived from the lifting of sanctions enable Iran to invest in proxy forces and conventional capabilities, such as advanced air defense systems, and to threaten Israel and Saudi Arabia.

Even more consequential is the fact that the Obama administration's single-minded pursuit of achieving and preserving the deal has held the other elements of our foreign policy toward Iran hostage. Iran is free to harass American vessels within the Persian Gulf, to test ballistic missiles, and to fund proxy forces.

After agreeing to the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, the President gathered the leaders of the Gulf Cooperation Council at Camp David. At that meeting, our President made commitments to those allies that we would help them in building their respective defense capabilities.

A vote in support of this resolution today undermines that commitment made by the President to help the Saudis. Our allies in the region, especially Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates, came to understand that after the fall of the Mubarak government, the decapitation of the government in Libya, and civil war in Syria, they must act in pursuit of their own sovereign interests, whether the United States would lead or not.

The specific foreign military sale in question here is for Abrams tank structures to Saudi Arabia. We have been selling ground combat equipment to Saudi Arabia for decades—for decades. There is no evidence—none—that the Saudis have used the Abrams tanks in ground combat within Yemen. These systems have been used along the Saudi Arabia border to defend against Houthi incursions.

The United States is actively working to improve Saudi targeting capa-

bility and to deliver humanitarian relief to the people of Yemen. So let us also remember that denying the sale of Abrams tank structures will simply lead some of our allies to pursue weapon systems from other countries.

Let me say that again. The Saudis don't have to buy this equipment from us. They can buy it from somebody else. So this motion comes at a singularly unfortunate time and would serve to convince Saudi Arabia and all other observers that the United States does not live up to its commitments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, let's be clear about what the arms sale is all about. It is about giving a nation that is under attack by an Iranian-sponsored militia the arms that it needs to defend its people and its territory.

The Houthi militia, which is Iran's proxy in Yemen, is attacking Saudi Arabia's southern border. It has carried out hundreds of cross-border raids into Saudi Arabia and has fired numerous missiles deep into Saudi territory. Make no mistake, this aggression is fueled by the Iranians.

Earlier this year, the United States seized a shipment of arms bound for the Houthi militia. Have no doubt that the Houthi militia are the clients and the stooges and the agents of Iran, which is attempting to take over control of Yemen, which is an important nation, particularly because of its geographic location on the Straits of Hormuz.

Have no doubt about what the situation would be strategically if the Iranian-sponsored Houthis controlled Yemen. Have no doubt about the threat that it is to the United States of America and to freedom of navigation.

Houthi aggression against Saudi Arabia has displaced over 75,000 Saudis and killed hundreds of civilians. If militias were attacking our borders and launching missiles into our territory and our friends refused to help us defend ourselves, we would certainly question the value of that friendship. This is why this sale is more important than just a sale. It is a message.

The sale will give Saudi Arabia tanks it has used to defend its own country from Houthi attacks. The United States has no evidence that Saudi Arabia has used the tanks outside of Saudi territory. In fact, 20 of the tanks in the case would be intended to replace those damaged by Houthi artillery while the tanks were on Saudi territory, deployed in defensive positions to counter offensive Houthi cross-border raids. These tanks will be reviewed and monitored like all U.S.-origin defense articles to ensure they are used in the manner intended or consistent with legal obligations and foreign policy goals and values.

I say to my colleagues that blocking this sale of tanks will be interpreted by our gulf partners—not just Saudi Arabia—as another sign that the United States of America is abandoning our

commitment to the region and is an unreliable security partner. That is what this vote is all about. The nations in the region already have that impression because President Obama has reneged on his promise made at the U.S.-Gulf Cooperation Council meeting at Camp David in May of 2015 to fast-track arms transfers.

As we support the Saudis in the defense of their territorial integrity, we do not refrain from expressing our concern about the war in Yemen and how it is being conducted. We remain concerned by the high number of casualties resulting from the fighting. We have repeatedly expressed our deepest concern about the ongoing strikes that have killed and injured civilians, the heavy toll paid by the Yemeni people, and the urgent and compelling need for humanitarian assistance. There has been some progress, including the establishment of the Joint Incident Assessment Team, a commission to investigate civilian casualties.

But we cannot forget that an Iranian-backed, Houthi-controlled Yemen will be a chaotic, unstable place ripe for exploitation not only by Iran but also by Al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula and ISIL. That is why it must be our goal and the goal of the international community to arrive at a political solution to bring stability and security back to Yemen. Saudi Arabia has been seeking such a solution.

The Saudis were cooperative and participated in good faith in the peace negotiations in Kuwait before those talks, unfortunately, broke down over Houthi intransigence. They have shown considerable restraint in not responding with airstrikes to Houthi cross-border attacks, which continue.

In the meantime, we must continue to support an important regional partner against Iran's destabilizing behavior in Yemen and beyond.

I say to my colleagues, this vote is more important than the sale of tanks. This vote is a message to our friends and our enemies alike. This message is that we will continue the commitment President Obama made at a meeting in 2015 with the nations in the region that we would expedite arms sales to them, not prohibit them. This is a message that one of the strongest forces against Al Qaeda in the region and other terrorist organizations is going to be allowed to acquire weapons with which to defend their sovereign nation.

This vote will resonate throughout the entire Middle East. That is why I hope my colleagues will understand that the importance of this vote transcends anything to do with military equipment. I urge my colleagues to vote against this resolution, and I urge my colleagues to vote overwhelmingly.

Madam President, 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. GRAHAM. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRAHAM. Madam President, I wish to speak for 10 minutes, and I request that the Presiding Officer let me know when that time expires.

This body, the Senate, is going to have a vote in a couple of hours about whether we should approve an arms sale to our friends in Saudi Arabia. I use the term "friends" because that is what I think they are when it comes to the efforts to win the war against terror.

Internal problems in Saudi Arabia are real. They need to modernize the way they do business. They have had double-dealing in the past of helping terrorist organizations. At the end of the day, the Mideast is a very complicated place, but here is what is not complicated: Saudi Arabia has shared intelligence with us that has made Americans safe. They have allowed us to use their air bases in times of conflict. They are all in against ISIL, and they are great allies against the ambitions of the Iranians. When you add up the pluses and the minuses of the relationship with Saudi Arabia, in my view, it is not close—the pluses outweigh the minuses.

To those who wish to sever this relationship, be careful what you wish for. Saudi Arabia is the center of gravity of the Islamic world. Most holy sites in Islam are in Saudi Arabia. I have met with the King, the Crown Prince, and the Deputy Crown Prince. They have shown a willingness to work with us at a time when we need partners. If you drive this good partner, Saudi Arabia, away, you will one day regret it.

This is what is going on in the Mideast. Iran is marching through the Mideast with terror. They are destabilizing the entire region. The Saudi Kingdom is not perfect, but they are aligned with us on the big issues when it comes to terrorism and pushing back against Iran.

The Iranian regime is controlled by a radical Ayatollah who openly chants and tweets that the State of Israel must be destroyed. This regime is in the hands of a religious Nazi. The Ayatollah in Iran controls everything. There are no moderate voices left there.

Since the deal with Iran has been signed regarding their nuclear program, they have test-fired four missiles in violation of U.N. resolutions. One of the missiles basically had in Hebrew "Israel must be destroyed." They constantly threaten our ally Israel. They have taken over four Arab capitals.

The Houthis, who threw out a pro-American government in Yemen by force of arms, is being supplied arms by the Iranians.

The \$150 billion the Iranian regime will receive in sanctions relief is finding its way into the hands of terrorist organizations. Hezbollah, a mortal

enemy of Israel, has been provided up to 300 new missiles with precision-guided technology by the Iranians to threaten the Jewish State. Assad wouldn't last 5 minutes without Iranian support. They have disrupted all of our gains inside of Iraq. They are influencing Baghdad in a very bad way.

When it comes to Yemen, when it comes to Iraq, and when it comes to Syria, Iran is creating havoc.

This body has a choice. We are talking about a \$1 billion package of armaments that will upgrade the Saudis' capability to fight common enemies such as Al Qaeda and ISIL more aggressively, and it will give them the military capability to challenge the increased threats to the region from of Iran.

If we say no to the Saudis, not only will that be seen as a sleight by the Saudis, they will buy their arms somewhere else.

And if you want to talk about a body that would have things ass backwards, this would be the moment in history where you will be seen in history as not understanding the world. There are some of my colleagues on the other side who are worried about how the Saudis are using military force inside of Yemen to protect their borders from an Iranian intrusion that is being basically carried forward by the Houthis. There is an effort to bring about peace in Yemen, but Iran has empowered the Houthis to displace a pro-American, pro-Western government, creating havoc for the Saudis. They have dropped bombs on civilians. There is no way to conduct war without mistakes being made. We are trying to sell them new equipment, precision-guided weapons that will lessen civilian casualties when Saudi Arabia has to defend themselves.

I think it would be pretty odd for Members on the other side of the aisle, who almost unanimously supported the Iranian nuclear agreement, to give sanctions relief to an Ayatollah who on the day of the vote said he hopes to destroy Israel in 25 years and deny a weapons sale to somebody who is in the fight with you. Talk about ass-backwards: flush the Iranian regime with capabilities they have dreamed of to pursue a nuclear deal that I think is a nightmare for the region, and in the same context, within a matter of months, start denying Arab allies who are willing to fight the capability to fight.

If you want to send a signal to the Ayatollah that America is out of the fight and we no longer are a reliable ally, stop helping Saudi Arabia and the Gulf Arab States, who have been helping us, as imperfect as they may be. What a world we live in, where this body wants to be tough on Saudi Arabia because they are in a shooting war in Yemen, sponsored by the Iranians, right on their border, that we want to cut off military aid to them because of human rights violations, when the people on the other side are watching Iran

destroy the Mideast, threaten us, and create the possibility of a second holocaust for the Jewish people. Not one person on the other side has risen their hand to say: You know, maybe we should revisit sanctions on Iran based on what they have done since we signed the deal.

So here is the answer. The Iranians have test-fired four ballistic missiles, after signing the Iranian nuclear agreement with us, in violation of U.N. resolutions, and our response is to cut off weapons to Saudi Arabia. We haven't done a damn thing to send a signal to the Ayatollah: Hey, man, you are going to pay a price if you keep doing this.

The Iranians are shipping weapons to the Houthis, who have destroyed a pro-American government, creating havoc in the region inside of Yemen, and our response is to cut off weapons to the Saudi Arabians.

If you want to change the Mideast forever, do this. If you really want to tell everybody who has fought with America you are no longer a reliable ally, do this. If you want to tell the Russians we are going to cede authority and power to them, do this. The Russians are pulling for us. The Russians would like nothing better than for America to cut off arms sales and alliances with the Gulf Arab States, particularly Saudi Arabia, because that would give them the opportunity of a lifetime. If you care about the American homeland, you better put Iran in a box as soon as you can.

Here is my belief about the Iranians. Not only are they trying to take over four Arab capitals—and they have—they are developing ballistic missiles to deliver something. They are not going to put the Ayatollah in space, though I would like to do that myself. They are going to put something on top of that missile and I know exactly what it is and all the Arabs know what it is and the Israelis know what it is.

So at a time of great and clear conflict—and it is clear to me the Iranians are the bad guys and our allies in the Arab world, though imperfect, are still our allies—that we are going to send a signal to the radical regime in Tehran that we are going to roll back supporting our allies and do nothing about their provocative behavior would be a mistake for the ages.

I wish the body would have a different debate than we are having today. I wish somebody would come and talk about reimposing sanctions on the Iranians. They have captured American sailors and humiliated them. They are allies of Bashar Assad, who has butchered 450,000 of his own people. They are empowering Hezbollah, the mortal enemy of Israel. They are humiliating every force of good, and our response is to stand up and undercut an ally.

What a world we live in, where the United States Senate is considering stopping selling arms to somebody who would fight with us at a time when we are doing nothing to a country that has

called us the Great Satan—and if they could, they would destroy us—and have killed American soldiers by providing radical groups inside of Iraq with IEDs that have killed hundreds of American soldiers. Talk about a body and an idea that is ass-backwards, this is one for the ages.

To my friends inside of Saudi Arabia, I will push you to do better, and you need to look in the mirror about who you are, but I understand there are more pluses than there are minuses. To our enemies in Iran—who are not the Iranian people, it is the Ayatollah—as long as I am here with my colleagues, we are going to push back against you more, not less, we are going to help our Arab allies more, not less, as long as you are doing what you are doing.

To those who want to vote today to suspend this aid to Saudi Arabia, people in Iran will cheer you on.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, while he is still on the floor, I just want to tell the Senator from South Carolina how much I appreciate his remarks. I agree with virtually everything he said. He is one of the most knowledgeable and articulate Members of the Congress on national security matters. He knows whereof he speaks and he speaks the truth.

JUSTICE AGAINST SPONSORS OF TERRORISM ACT

Madam President, I have come to the floor a few times this last week to talk about another piece of legislation called the Justice Against Sponsors of Terrorism Act, known as JASTA. This might as well be known as the justice for the 9/11 families bill.

I support the position articulated by the Senator from South Carolina and will vote against the resolution of disapproval to block the Saudi arms sale. I believe that is the same position articulated by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, Senator MCCAIN, and the majority leader, Senator MCCONNELL, and I find myself in agreement with each of them. Some might say: Well, how can you agree to maintain the relationship with Saudi Arabia when it comes to providing them with the necessary arms they need in order to fight this proxy war by Iran against the Gulf State allies and at the same time support this Justice Against Sponsors of Terrorism Act, which some say may be focused on the Saudis. I would like to explain that.

First of all, let me just say that when I think about the Senate, I am reminded of the comments made by Robert Byrd, the distinguished Senator from West Virginia who is no longer with us. He wrote books on Senate procedure. He wrote a history of the United States Senate. He was truly a remarkable man. He was also former majority leader of the Senate and a force to be reckoned with. When I came to the Senate, Senator Byrd said, among other things: In the Senate, you

have no permanent allies. In the Senate, he said, you have no permanent enemies.

I believe what he meant by that was that on a case-by-case basis, people who come from different regions of the country, different States with different interests, will work together where their interests are aligned, and when they are not, they are going to differ—respectfully, I would hope—but they are not going to always do the same thing or see the world in exactly the same way. That doesn't mean we are enemies. That doesn't mean we are adversaries. That is just the way it works.

As I think about our relationship with countries such as Saudi Arabia—but it is not just Saudi Arabia, it is all of our international relationships—we are going to agree with them on matters of principle when our interests are aligned. We are. And certainly in the case of this arms sale, our interests are perfectly aligned.

Saudi Arabia finds itself in a very rough neighborhood, subjected to violence and war perpetrated by Iran, frequently through proxy groups such as Hezbollah, the Houthis, and other forces, but it is very much in the U.S. interest that Iran not continue to dominate the whole region in the Middle East. Obviously, they have made great strides in dominating and influencing Iraq.

Unfortunately, as a result of the misguided nuclear deal negotiated by the White House, Iran is now on a pathway toward a nuclear weapon. One can imagine what our other allies, such as Saudi Arabia and the other Gulf States, are thinking. If our No. 1 adversary in the region is going to get a nuclear weapon, we may need to defend ourselves. By what? Well, by getting nuclear weapons. That makes the world a much more dangerous place.

My point is, when it comes to relationships between Senators from different States, representing different regions and different interests, even though we sometimes agree with each other, sometimes disagree with each other, that is just the way the Senate works, and that is the way I believe the world works. When our interests are aligned with countries such as Saudi Arabia, we will stand with them, and we hope they will stand with us. When they diverge, we are going to take a little different approach.

I believe it is absolutely imperative we override the forthcoming veto of the Justice Against Sponsors of Terrorism Act so the families who suffered so much and lost so much on 9/11 can go to court and make the case, if they can, to hold whoever was responsible accountable. That is just as basic as anything in our system of justice. That is not for us to decide. We are not a court of law. The rules of procedure and the rules of evidence don't apply here. Sometimes I wish they did. In court, you can't just introduce hearsay or conspiracy theories and not back

them up. They have to be based upon reliable testimony as determined by a judge.

That is what the 9/11 families are going to get, is the opportunity to make their case, if they can. I don't know if they are going to be successful, but I do believe one of the most fundamental things about our system of government is the opportunity to try. If you think you have a case to make, present it to the judge and try to make your case. You may win. You may lose.

I spent 13 years of my adult life as a trial judge and on an appellate court, the Texas Supreme Court. Maybe I just became too familiar with how courts operate. Maybe I have more confidence in the ability of the courts to sift through these matters and get to the bottom of them than some of my other colleagues do, but I have confidence, by and large, in the Federal judiciary, and I believe under the oversight of a good Federal judge, they are going to enter the appropriate sort of protective orders necessary to protect people sued against overreaching and fishing expeditions when it comes to discovery, for example. The judge is going to make sure everybody plays by the rules and does not take unfair advantage.

So enough about that. But I believe, unlike a few of my colleagues whose comments I have read about, the Justice Against Sponsors of Terrorism Act does not target a specific country. As I have mentioned time and time again, we don't even mention a specific country in the legislation. All it does is extend a law dating back to 1978—the Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act—and it says that in a narrow set of facts, you may be able to sue a foreign government. In this case, if you sponsor or facilitate a terrorist attack on American soil, you will have been deemed by law to have waived your sovereign immunity and you will be held accountable in court.

Again, I have read the 28 pages that remain classified from the 9/11 report. I have read other responses from our law enforcement and intelligence authorities. I can't talk about that here. I will not talk about that here.

I believe the families do deserve an opportunity to make their case, and I trust that we will override the President's veto once it arrives here after Friday. But it is absolutely imperative that we keep our promises to our allies like Saudi Arabia, particularly where it serves our own national security interests. They live in the region. They are working as a counterbalance and a check on Iranian hegemony. As the Senator from South Carolina noted, Iran is the biggest troublemaker, not only in the Middle East but maybe on the planet. They have been trying to wipe Israel off the map using proxy forces like Hezbollah and Hamas. Obviously, they have been working their mischief in Iraq. After Saddam Hussein was deposed, President al-Maliki was put in place, but unfortunately because of his favoritism toward the Shia Mus-

lims and his opposition to Sunni Muslims, he essentially joined common cause with Iran. Now we find ourselves in the unenviable position, as U.S. military forces that are training and assisting Iranian security forces—as they march forward to Mosul to take that back from the Islamic State, we are literally going to be fighting side by side with Iranian militias directed by the No. 1 state sponsor of terrorism. It is outrageous that we find ourselves in this situation.

I encourage our colleagues to vote against the resolution of disapproval. This bill would keep the United States from supporting Saudi Arabia in ways that benefit our country strategically. As we have heard, that includes tanks and other equipment to help the Saudis maintain control of their border in a very dangerous and tumultuous part of the world and most importantly to help them protect themselves from an emboldened Iran that is awash in cash as a result of the President's misguided, bad nuclear deal in lifting sanctions on the Iranians.

In the long run, I think voting for this bill would actually help Iran and strengthen its hand, and I certainly cannot and will not support that.

Madam President, 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. DONNELLY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUICIDE PREVENTION

Mr. DONNELLY. Madam President, I rise today in recognition of suicide prevention, to continue to shine a light on the impact of suicide and to discuss the importance of efforts to strengthen mental health care. Sadly, too many Hoosiers and Americans are taken from us by suicide, shattering families and communities. Today, I want to talk about suicide prevention as it relates to our servicemembers, our veterans, and their families.

Last year, sadly, for the fourth straight year, more U.S. troops were lost to suicide than in combat. In 2015, 475 servicemembers took their own lives. Prior to that, we lost 443 servicemembers in 2014, and 474 servicemembers in 2013. We are painfully aware of the statistic that an estimated 20 veterans a day take their own lives.

These numbers allude to hundreds upon thousands of individual tragedies that have rocked our families, our communities, and our Nation. These numbers represent sons and daughters, brothers and sisters, and husbands and wives who have dedicated their lives to the service of this Nation and have succumbed to invisible wounds. These numbers illustrate the simple, terrible fact that we are losing too many of our servicemembers and veterans to suicide. These numbers demand that we

keep efforts to improve military and veterans mental health services and suicide prevention efforts at the top of our to-do list in the Senate.

Despite gridlock in Congress, this is an issue where we have solid bipartisan consensus. I have seen it firsthand, working year after year with my colleagues, Republicans and Democrats, to work to improve military mental health care.

In 2014, my bipartisan Jacob Sexton Military Suicide Prevention Act was signed into law. The Sexton act, named for a young Hoosier whom we lost far too soon, established for the first time a requirement that every servicemember—Active, Guard, and Reserve—receive an annual mental health assessment.

Building on the success of the Sexton act, last year we had provisions of my bipartisan Servicemember and Veterans Mental Health Care Package signed into law, which helped expand access to quality mental health care for servicemembers and delivered mental health care in a way that meets the unique needs of servicemembers and veterans, whether through the Department of Defense or civilian providers right in our home communities.

While passing these laws is a step in the right direction, it will take a consistent, concerted effort to bring the number of servicemember suicides down to zero. We need to ensure that the laws we have passed, including the Sexton act and the care package, are implemented correctly so the services reach the troops and the veterans who need them the most. We need to keep working on smart legislation that streamlines access and strengthens the quality of mental health care.

This has been a top priority for me since I first introduced the Sexton act in 2013—my first bill as a U.S. Senator. It remains a top priority for me today.

This year, the final provision of my bipartisan care package passed the Senate as part of the national defense bill. It expands the ability of physician assistants to provide mental health care evaluations and services for servicemembers and their families. The bill establishes a pilot program to expand the use of physician assistants specializing in psychiatric care to help address the mental health care provider shortage.

This legislation can help make a difference for our servicemembers in Indiana and across the entire country. I urge Congress to come together on a final defense bill that can be sent to the President and signed into law.

There is no single solution that ends suicide. We may never fully understand the internal battles that lead to an individual taking his or her own life. However, this much is clear: We must do more to help prevent military and veteran suicides. Throughout September, we will recognize Suicide Prevention Month, but this issue demands our attention and our efforts every single day of the year.

To our servicemembers and veterans struggling with mental health challenges and to your loved ones, we are here for you, and we will not stop working until you receive the care you deserve and the support you need. We will be there with you every step of the way.

Mr. President, I yield back.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TILLIS). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, you wouldn't think that I would have to keep coming here to talk about how it is our responsibility to do everything in our power to grow American manufacturing jobs, keep manufacturing jobs, and make sure American manufacturers are competitive in the global economy.

When young people come to my office to talk about the future, the one thing I tell them—and it is critical that you never forget this—is that 95 percent of all potential consumers in the world today do not live in this country. If you want to be successful in the future, you are going to have to be competitive and you are going to have to be innovative and do everything you can to grab that market share. That is how our economy is going to grow. It is what brings new wealth to our country, and that gives us the opportunity to advance an economic and political agenda that will move our country and the values we have in this democracy forward.

What do we do? We stall out by saying that even though 90 or 80 other countries have export credit agencies that can assist in financing those manufacturing jobs and those purchases, we, the United States of America, are going to tie the hands of a 70-year-old institution that has functioned incredibly well to bring jobs and wealth to our country. We are going to do it not because the will of this body and this Congress hasn't been expressed—in fact, it is the opposite.

When we reauthorized the Export-Import Bank, we were able to secure almost 70 percent of the Senate and over 70 percent of the House. It sounds like a mandate to me. It sounds like an understanding that most of the people in this institution understand the importance of a credit export agency. Guess what. We have now told our export agency: We are not going to give you the structure or the power to function. If you want to do a deal that is more than \$10 million, we won't be there. We will not be there to provide assistance or guarantees, and we will not be able to help American businesses be competitive internationally.

A lot of people will say: Well, those are just the big guys. Those are the

Boeings, GEs, and Caterpillars of the world.

That totally ignores how American manufacturing is done. American manufacturing is done in small shops all across this country, small businesses that have been a part of that supply chain for decades and have relied on the corporate innovation and selling of large aircraft, large construction equipment, and large gas turbines and generators.

Do you know what is going to happen when those manufacturers or assemblers do not have export financing? Guess what they do. They say: I have to move someplace else where I can get it. If I am going to sell my products in the global market, I have to be able to qualify for export financing, and that means I have to move those manufacturing jobs—manufacturing gas turbines or manufacturing small parts—to France, where there is an environment and government that understands the importance of providing this important trade resource.

As we sit here today collectively worried about the middle class and America's competitiveness in manufacturing and trying to grow our global presence and our global exports, we take one critical piece of trade infrastructure and say: Can't use it. It is not because people here don't think so or because the American people don't think that is a good idea.

When you talk about this with the American people, they say: That is crazy. Something that returns dollars to the Treasury and provides this resource to grow American jobs and we are not going to do it?

And I say: We are not going to do it because the conservative think tanks in Washington, DC, whose influence is outsized from their ideas and political support, decided it is not a good idea—whether it is Club for Growth, the Heritage Foundation, CATO, or whichever one comes forward and says it is not a good idea.

We are talking about American jobs and American manufacturing, and we can do something about it with a simple act, which in this CR we have to do because we can't move on the nominee who would give us a quorum on the Ex-Im Bank, and that is what is holding us up. The Ex-Im Bank operates like a lot of banks. It has a board of directors. When that board of directors doesn't have a quorum, they can't make decisions on credits over \$10 million. We have \$20 billion worth of business we could be doing internationally that is held up by the lack of a quorum.

I get it. We are about regular order, right? I don't know what regular order says about not sending a nominee out of a committee so we can vote him up or down. This is the argument I get: We have never had a debate. Really? I can't tell you how many times I have stood in this spot debating the Ex-Im Bank and the values and importance of the Export-Import Bank, but they say we haven't had a debate.

I said: If you want to have a debate, move the nominee to the floor and let's have a debate. You don't want to have a debate because you could lose.

They don't want to have a debate because they will, in fact, lose in this body if that nominee comes up.

I recognize there is support for regular order, if we can call it that. To me, regular order means getting your job done. It doesn't mean stalling out and stopping American innovation and American exports.

Let's say we go to regular order. Now we are working on trying to change the quorum rule so that people can actually make a decision and move these credits forward and get Americans back to work and get us back to exporting.

Where are we right now? Well, we read in the press that once again the outsized—for their political support—interest groups in this town are saying: Don't do it.

American manufacturing is hurt, and American manufacturing is calling and saying: We must do it, and we can't wait until the end of the year. We can't wait to do this credit.

The last time I came here, I brought what I call a payload, a front-end loader. I brought a loader here, and I talked about the manufacturing of that piece of equipment in my State. I talked about a huge credit and a huge deal we could do that involved international credit with a dealership, which would include manufacturers in Iowa, Kansas, and North Dakota—all American jobs. It obviously didn't influence anyone or we would have gotten it done.

So now I am asking that everybody who says they are for American workers, American progress, and American exports to call leadership. This is something we have to do. It is bipartisan and it is nonpartisan. I know the Democrats have put it on their list of asks, but it shouldn't be a Democratic-Republican issue. I have good allies on the other side of the aisle who want to move this forward as well. When we can't move a piece of legislation and an idea that has supermajority support, that is when the American public says: Guess what. This is a broken institution. This is an institution that doesn't function for the American people.

When American jobs and when American workers get pink slips because we aren't doing our job here, that is a sad day for the Congress, and it is a sad day for what we do here.

Standing on principle is one thing. You fought the fight and the Bank was reauthorized. Let's get the Bank fully functioning. Let's get a resolution and a provision in the continuing resolution that actually provides for reviving and moving the Ex-Im Bank forward.

As I have said before in this very spot, I don't go to bed worried about the CEOs of major companies. They have options. They can move those jobs overseas. They will function just fine. They are a part of multinational businesses. I go to bed worried about that

worker who has to come home with a pink slip because there is no longer the opportunity to sell what is being manufactured. Don't think that is not happening right now in the United States of America because it is. Those pink slips are on us. Those pink slips are happening because we have an institution that does not function in a majority fashion and for the people of this country and certainly for the middle class.

Everybody who says they are for the middle class, why don't we just quit engaging in lipservice and start taking action that tells American manufacturers, American workers, and American business that we are going to stand with them as they innovate, export, and grow the economy of this country?

When everybody says our economic growth is sluggish, I look at them and say: Do you know how we can amp it up? By exporting. Do you know why we are not exporting \$20 billion worth of goods in this country? Because we do not have a fully functioning Ex-Im Bank.

There is no way anyone could look at this logically and say this is good public policy.

I couldn't be more distraught or more sympathetic about what is happening to American workers. It is time we all work together.

I know the Presiding Officer is very interested in moving the Bank forward as well, and we all need to make sure we get this problem taken care of before we leave in October.

With that, I yield my time.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I rise to speak about the vote that is going to take place at 2:15 p.m., and I urge my colleagues to vote to table this motion. The motion itself would keep us from being able to follow through on a sale of arms to Saudi Arabia.

It is my belief that the appropriate policy here is to table this motion, and let me take a few moments to share why I feel that way.

First of all, this is not a subsidized sale; this is a sale where a country is trying to buy U.S. weaponry with its own money. This is not the United States giving foreign aid to another country. This is a situation where an ally that is certainly an imperfect ally—they are very aware they have public relations issues within our own country for lots of reasons, but they are an ally nonetheless—has looked around and decided and feels it is the best thing for them to do relative to the purchase of the tanks and other

weaponry listed here. By the way, they already own tanks like this already, and they can go someplace else to purchase them.

Let me start out by saying that we had a huge debate in the Senate about the Iran nuclear deal. We ended up in different places. Fifty-eight people decided they didn't like it, but I think everyone probably has concerns about Iran and what they are doing in the Middle East.

During that timeframe, the administration met at Camp David with Saudi Arabia and some of our other Arab friends in the region and mentioned that in order to counter the nefarious activities Iran is involved in—and I think everyone in this body would agree they are involved in nefarious activities; they are a country we stated is a state sponsor of terrorism—in order to counter that, we would expedite sales to friends like Saudi Arabia and the UAE and other countries in the region, and this is a part of that. In essence, for us to back away from this would be saying we do not want to counter the nefarious activities of terrorism Iran is conducting in the region.

I understand my friend from Kentucky has heartfelt concerns about some of the aid we have provided other countries, and we have had very responsible discussions. Again, this is not aid. This is an ally we are utilizing in our alliance as a balance of power against what Iran is doing in the region. In essence, by not following through on sales to friends like Saudi Arabia and other countries, what we are really saying is, we want to undermine the balance of power that is created there in the region.

Let me say something else. I have noticed in this body that people are far less willing to want to commit U.S. troops in foreign places. There is a range of feelings about that, but I would say, generally speaking, I don't think there is any question that Americans are far less willing to commit massive ground troops to efforts in the Middle East. If we know that to be the mood of the public today, the last thing we would want to do is to not provide the armaments necessary for countries that might be willing to counter terrorism in the region.

Again, to me, this is one of those cases where I think the sponsors of the legislation and those who are advocating for it are well-meaning people, but it is a case where I think we are cutting our nose off to spite our face. I don't understand any policy objective we can be achieving by saying we have a country that wants to buy our equipment with their money—no foreign aid involved whatsoever—and we are unwilling to sell it to them.

Let me make one last point. We have an infrastructure in our country that is utilized to protect us in tough times. These are lines of building equipment that we utilize if we ever have to gear up, and I hope that is not the case again in the near future. If we ever

have to gear up again for operations in other countries, we rely upon these alliances. So what other countries do in purchasing equipment from us is they keep those lines and keep those employees and keep that technology building in such a way that it is useful for us in the future.

Again, I cannot identify a single policy objective we can achieve by blocking a sale to someone who has been an ally. Although not perfect, they are an ally. They are helping us with the balance of power. They are helping us in the fight against some of the efforts that are underway with Iran now in Yemen—we are not involved in that directly; they are helping us with that—and they are a country that again is willing to buy U.S.-made equipment that helps us keep in place the infrastructure that is necessary for us over time to protect our country.

I am glad we are having this debate. I hope we table this motion overwhelmingly to send a message that again we see no good policy objective in carrying out the blocking of this sale.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I want to address the issues at the heart of S. J. Res. 39, the resolution introduced by Senators PAUL, MURPHY, LEE, and FRANKEN regarding the sale of \$1.15 billion in military equipment to the Government of Saudi Arabia.

Despite obvious differences in our systems of government and concerning the rights of women and other issues, the United States and Saudi Arabia have a longstanding partnership that has benefited both countries. For roughly six decades, security cooperation has been an important part of the relationship, fueled by military sales to Saudi Arabia under both Republican and Democratic administrations. For its part, the Government of Saudi Arabia has pledged to work with the United States in countering terrorism in the region.

But what has been unfolding in Yemen since the spring of 2015 should concern all Senators. There have been frequent, credible reports of Saudi Arabian armed forces indiscriminately attacking civilian-populated areas, targeting civilians, and otherwise misusing U.S.-origin weapons; of humanitarian access being impeded; and of a lack of serious investigations of, and accountability for, those who have alleged to have caused civilian casualties.

I am not opposed to training and equipping our allies or selling them the weapons they require to combat terrorism. But the conditions under which we provide such support must include a commitment to avoid civilian casualties and to ensure that if egregious harm is done to the civilian population there are thorough investigations, punishment if warranted, and assistance is provided to the victims. We should also be confident that the strategy and tactics of our allies are achieving goals that we share.

Since the earliest reports of harm inflicted by Saudi forces on the civilian

population in Yemen, I have repeatedly raised this issue with the Department of State. Although the Department and Saudi officials have offered assurances that effective steps are being taken to avoid civilian casualties and to investigate when they occur, the attacks and casualties have continued. Efforts by the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights to conduct an independent investigation into war crimes in Yemen have to date been rebuffed by the Saudi Government. There is scant evidence that the assurances reflect a meaningful change in strategy or tactics or that the Saudi military operations in Yemen are achieving their goals.

That is why I cannot support the provision of military equipment, particularly on this scale, to any country as long as legitimate concerns regarding the manner in which such equipment is being used remain unaddressed. It is inconsistent with the laws of war, and it implicates, at least indirectly, the United States. I need to be convinced that the Saudi Government is taking effective steps to reduce civilian casualties, to address the harm caused by its operations, and to support the unimpeded flow of humanitarian aid to those in need.

Therefore, I will support the resolution and oppose the motion to table.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, 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.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, today the Senate will discuss questions of war and peace. Today the Senate will do its constitutional duty for a change. Let's be very clear, though. The Senate does this under duress.

The Senate has abdicated its role in foreign policy for too long. We have been at war nearly continuously for 15 years and the initiation, conclusion, and resumption of war has not had debate in this body. The last time we voted on whether we should be at war was the Iraq war, which was a very emotional vote. It is a war that has long been over.

There is now a new war in Iraq and Syria, but there has been no congressional authorization. Therefore, it is illegal and unconstitutional.

Today's debate will attempt to debate whether or not we should initiate war in Yemen. It is an indirect vote because they won't allow a direct vote. In fact, they would not have allowed this debate had I and several others not forced it. But this is a bipartisan coalition that has brought this issue to the floor and said: We should debate issues of war.

I know young men who have lost limbs in the war. I know young men

and their families who have sacrificed their lives. They deserve to have the country debate when and where we should be at war. It should never be something that we slide into.

Now, some will say: No, we are debating over whether to sell arms to Saudi Arabia. Yes, but I would also argue that we are at war in Yemen. Whether or not we sell arms to Saudi Arabia for the war in Yemen is something that should be debated because it is not just about selling arms. It is about whether we will be complicit in a war in Yemen.

If there is no debate in Congress, if there is no debate in the public, are we ready to spend lives, money, and treasure on another war in Yemen? People will say: Oh, no big deal, we are not really at war in Yemen. Well, yes, we are. We are refueling Saudi bombers that are dropping bombs in Yemen. There is said to be over 3,000 innocent people who have died in Yemen from Saudi bombs. What do you think happens to those families when 100 people die in a wedding in Yemen? What do you think happens to those families? Do you think they have a warm, fuzzy feeling for Saudi Arabia and the United States, which is helping to pick the targets and fuel the planes? Don't you think we as a country ought to have a debate before we go to war? Don't you think we ought to read the Constitution?

Our Founding Fathers had a significant, detailed, and explicit debate over war. They explicitly took the power to declare war, and they gave it to the legislature. Madison wrote that the executive is the branch most prone to war. Therefore, with studied care, the Constitution took the power to declare war and vested it in the legislature. This is repeated throughout the Federalist papers. It is repeated by all of our Founding Fathers that the power to initiate war was too important to place in the hands of one individual.

But over the last decade and a half, we have been at war in Libya without the permission of the American people or Congress. We have been at war in Syria and Iraq without the permission of the American people. Now we are at war in Yemen without the approval of Congress or the American people.

So this is a twofold debate today. It is a debate over whether the United States should be at war without a vote of Congress. I think our Founding Fathers were clear on this. It is absolutely certain that it was supposed to be a prerogative of Congress, but there are also practical concerns.

Some have come to the floor and said: Well, Saudi Arabia is an imperfect ally. Well, I would go a little bit further. Saudi Arabia has often done things that have not been good for America, have not been in our national interest, and have not been consistent with our understanding of human rights.

Let's give a few examples. The girl of Qatif was raped by seven men. Saudi Arabia put her in prison for the crime

of being alone with a man. You see, it is the woman's fault because women don't get to testify. The testimony comes from her attackers, and the woman of Qatif was given 7 years in prison and 200 lashes.

There is a poet who was writing in Indonesia who is Saudi Arabian and who was picked up by Interpol and taken home to be given the death penalty for possible criticism of the state religion.

There was a young 17-year-old man who is a Shia, a minority, who was a protester at a rally. I think he is 21 now. He has been in prison for 4 years. His uncle was beheaded by the government 1 month or 2 ago and was, by all appearances, a religious leader, not a collaborator, not an espionage perpetrator. The man is now 21, has been in prison for 4 years, and faces beheading in Saudi Arabia.

You might say: Well, human rights just aren't important. We need to do what is right for us in the region. We have given Saudi Arabia \$100 billion worth of weapons—\$100 billion. OK, we didn't give it to them; we sold it to them. But you know what. I think the taxpayer owns our weaponry. We have an ownership interest in our weaponry. This is not the free market. The weaponry was developed with taxpayer money and with explicit reservations that we in Congress can control who it is sold to. So we do need to ask, and it is an important debate, and we should be having it here in this body instead of leaving it up to the President. Let's have the debate.

Is Saudi Arabia a good ally?

Well, we have had this war in Syria for some time now. It is a messy war, a sectarian war. Most of the rebel groups are Sunni Muslims and the government is more allied with the Shites. In this war, there have been hundreds and hundreds of tons of weapons—some by us, but maybe 10-fold more by Saudi Arabia and Qatar. There has been public report after public report after public report saying that these weapons that are being poured into the country by Saudi Arabia have been given indiscriminately. They have been weapons about which some would say: Oh, they are being given to the pro-Americans. One group said that when they were done with Assad, they would go after Israel. It doesn't sound like people who are necessarily our friends.

According to public reports, many of these weapons that Saudi Arabia has bought from us and channeled into Syria have gone to al-Nusra, an off-branch of Al Qaeda. They used the justification to go to war in Syria—the 9/11 justification that said we would go after those who attacked us. I thought that was Al Qaeda. Are we now giving arms to Saudi Arabia, which is giving arms to Al Qaeda and al-Nusra? There have been some reports that the arms have gone directly to ISIS.

I think it has been indiscriminate, inexcusable, and not in our national interest.

How do we know what is in our national interest? We have to have a debate. Instead, Congress wants to be a lap dog for an imperial Presidency—Republican or Democrat, rubberstamped. Here you go—not even a rubberstamp. There is no vote, no discussion, nothing. We are forcing this debate against the wishes of both parties, because both parties are complicit in this. This is not a Republican versus Democrat issue. This is a bipartisan foreign policy consensus that says that we should always give weapons without conditions, indiscriminately. It is \$100 billion of weapons to Saudi Arabia—more than any other President. President Obama has given more.

You say: Why does he do this? Well, because we released about \$100 billion worth of Iranian assets, and the Saudis bug him and say: Well, Iran is getting all this money. We need weapons, too. So it fuels an arms race over there.

But here is the great irony of this. It is something that is so ironic that this body cannot overcome it. Unanimously, this body voted to let 9/11 victims sue Saudi Arabia. Now, why would we let them do that unless the people who voted unanimously actually believe that there is a possibility Saudi Arabia had something to do with 9/11? So the body that voted unanimously that there is a possibility that Saudi Arabia had something to do with 9/11 is now going to vote overwhelmingly to send weapons to the country they think might have had something to do with 9/11?

Is Saudi Arabia an ally or an enemy? I sometimes call them “frenemy.” I am not arguing that they never do anything that is good for us. They do on occasion. They also do many things that aren’t good for us. As we look through the list of things and we look to the arms that have been channeled into this region, we wonder: Will we be better off? Will our national security be better off or worse off?

For example, as to the weapons that Saudi Arabia poured into Syria, they pushed back Assad, and there occurred a vacuum in the Syrian civil war. Guess who came to occupy that vacuum? Guess who grew stronger and stronger in the absence of Assad and in the chaos of the civil war? ISIS.

In Yemen, you have several factions fighting. It is maybe not quite as complicated as Syria, but you have Salafis, people who believe in the primitive, intolerant form of Islam that Saudi Arabia practices. These people are allied with Saudi Arabia. They are fighting against rebels they call the Houthi rebels. The Houthi rebels are allied with Iran and in all likelihood are supplied by Iran. They fight each other. It is somewhat of a proxy war between Saudi Arabia and Iran.

You say: Don’t we hate Iran so much that we have to be involved everywhere to stop Iran? I don’t know. Saudi Arabia funds hatred around the world. Does Iran fund madrassas in our country? That is a really good question. I don’t think I heard anybody ask it.

I am not apologizing for Iran, by any means, but Iran, to my knowledge, does not fund madrassas in our country. Saudi Arabia does. Saudi Arabia funds madrassas around the world that teach hatred of America, hatred of the West, and hatred of Christianity. By the way, if you are a Christian, don’t bother trying to go to Saudi Arabia. You are not allowed in Mecca, you are not allowed in Medina, and God forbid you bring a Bible into their country. This is whom we want to send more weapons to?

What of the Yemen war? What happens as the weapons pour into Yemen? Is it possible that ISIS and Al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula sit by laughing and rubbing their hands, watching the war between the Houthis and the Salafis, and then step into the breach? It is what happened in Syria.

Are we not to learn the lessons of the Middle East? Are we to completely stick our heads in the sand and say: We must always give weapons, and if we don’t give weapons, that is isolationism. That is, literally, what people are saying. It is isolationism not to send \$1 billion worth of weapons. To send \$1 billion less would somehow be isolationism. Well, perhaps it would send a message.

There have been people who have described Saudi Arabia as both arsonists and firefighters—throwing fuel and adding fuel to the flames and at times being our friend and being helpful, maybe giving us some information or some intelligence.

As to the Syrian civil war, nothing good has come from that civil war. Arms have been plowed into that country from both sides, and there is nothing good. But one concrete thing has come from the Syrian civil war—millions of refugees, millions of displaced people. They have flooded Europe, and they are wanting to come to America also.

What do you think will happen in Yemen if we put more weapons in there? What do you think happens in Yemen if we put more arms into Yemen? More or less refugees? There will be millions of refugees coming. They will be flooding out of Yemen, if they can get out of there, as the war accelerates.

Does Saudi Arabia help with the refugees? Does Qatar help? Do any of the Gulf States take any refugees? Zero. Saudi Arabia has taken zero refugees. So while they fan the flames, while they send arms into Syria and arms into Yemen and bombs into Yemen, they take zero refugees from Yemen or from Syria. Somehow it always seems to be America’s responsibility to pay for everything and to absorb the brunt of the civil wars throughout the Middle East.

I think there is another answer. I am not saying that we can’t be allied with Saudi Arabia, but I am saying that they need a significant message sent to them. I am saying they need to change their behavior, and I am saying there

needs to be evidence that Saudi Arabia has changed their behavior. This evidence needs to be that they quit funding madrassas that preach hate; that they come into the modern world and quit beheading people when they don’t like what they say; that they quit beating and imprisoning the victims of rape.

I think we should think long and hard about war. I think war should always be the last resort, not the first resort. I don’t think it should be easy to go to war. I think our Founding Fathers understood that. They did not want to give one man or one woman the power to declare war, the power to initiate war. That power was specifically and explicitly given to Congress.

There is something to be said about the corrupting influence of power. Lincoln said: If you want to test a man, give him power. The true test is whether a man can resist the allure of power. I think this President has, on many occasions, failed that allure, whether it is privacy or whether it is issues of war.

President Obama once was a defender of privacy and once was a defender of the Constitution, but for some reason, the power of the office has caused him to forget the constitutional restraints that disallow even him from creating, causing, engaging in war without our permission.

But there is blame to go around. For partisan reasons, we want to blame the other party sometimes, but if you look at the blame and who is to blame, there is a great deal of blame to go around—the President for taking us to war without our permission, but even more so, Congress for its abdication of our role, our responsibility.

The last vote on going to war was for the Iraq war in 2002. We have not voted to go back to war. We have abdicated our responsibility.

There is a young man in the military currently who is actually suing over an order he was given to go to war because he said it is not constitutional for him to go to war without the permission of Congress. The President once understood this.

This is a proxy debate over whether Congress has a role, whether we are relevant in foreign policy, and whether we will stand up and do our duty. We should be debating on this floor with every Member present whether the President will be authorized to fight a war in Syria and Iraq.

We should also have that same debate on Yemen because we are involved in the war in Yemen, and everyone who loses their life there believes that it is not only Saudi Arabia that is bombing them, they believe it is us. We are refueling the bombers in midair, we are helping to choose the targets, and we have people embedded within this war zone. So make no mistake, we are at war in Yemen. We are at war illegally and unconstitutionally and without the permission of Congress.

We should immediately stop everything we are doing and debate a use of

authorization of force for the Middle East. Everybody says they are for it on both sides, yet it never happens because it is messy. It is messy also because I think the American people might wake up to the facts. They might wake up to the fact that ISIS grew in the midst of a Syrian civil war. They might wake up to the fact that our involvement in the Yemen war may well make Al Qaeda stronger, may well make ISIS stronger.

This is a twofold debate. It is a debate over whether you can go to war without the authority of Congress, but it is also a debate over selling arms and whether that will be in our national interest. I think we still do own these arms. Those arms are not privately owned by a company. We paid for the research for them. They are owned by the taxpayer, and by law there are restrictions as to where they can be sold.

I don't believe Saudi Arabia is an ally we can trust. The fact is, they continue to support schools in our country—schools that preach hatred of our country, preach hatred of Israel, and preach hatred of civilization, as far as I am concerned. I just don't see how we send them the correct message by saying: You can have unlimited arms from us.

Some say this is too far. I say this is too little. But I think there will be something that occurs today. It will occur despite what the majority wants. This is a debate, but this is not the end of the debate. If we lose the battle on the vote, we will have begun the debate over whether Congress is relevant. Whether or not we go to war without the permission of Congress, this is the beginning of the debate. Part of the victory is that we are having this debate, but mark my words—we are having this debate only because it has been forced upon Congress. No one on either side of the aisle wants this debate. If they could, this would be shuffled under the rug. It has occurred only because the law mandates that they allow it to occur. But this should be occurring on moments of war, on issues of war, and I regret that we don't do it.

I hope in the future this will be a lesson to the American people and to the Senate that it is our duty, and there is no duty above our duty to decide when and where we go to war.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. FISHER). The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CORKER. Madam President, I have respect for my friend from Kentucky. We have had numbers of conversations about this. I think he is aware that I am holding up, as chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, subsidies going to Pakistan in their purchase of F-16s. I do so because I don't believe we should be subsidizing a country that has been so duplicitous with us in so many ways.

So there are some issues we agree with, including the fact that I am glad to be having this debate. I do think Congress is playing a role today. Regardless of how you vote, Congress is

exercising itself. I am glad that is occurring. I just think it is cutting our nose off to spite our face to block a sale—a sale. This is not being subsidized.

Saudi Arabia is not a perfect ally, but they have chosen to pursue and purchase U.S. equipment versus Russian equipment or Chinese equipment or some other equipment. This is a sale that benefits us. It benefits our country in a number of ways. If I may, I will lay those out one more time.

No. 1, one of the things that have occurred with the Iran deal is that we have upset, to a degree, perceptually the balance of power in the Middle East. Even the President, who brought forth the Iran deal that I opposed and the majority of people on the floor opposed, realized that was going to be a problem. He convened Saudi Arabia and the UAE and some of our other Arab allies at Camp David and suggested that we would expedite sales to these countries in order to push back against the nefarious activities that we know Iran is conducting. All of us agree with that. They are a state sponsor of terror.

So, in essence, if we block a sale to a country that we have agreed, in order to strengthen our alliance with them and to counter what Iran is doing—all we are doing is cutting our nose off to spite our face.

Mr. MCCAIN. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CORKER. Yes.

Mr. MCCAIN. Is it correct that in Yemen, the Houthis are a proxy for Iran?

Mr. CORKER. No question.

Mr. MCCAIN. It is true that weapons supplies from Iran have been intercepted?

Mr. CORKER. We have interdicted them several times.

Mr. MCCAIN. Is it true—would you estimate, given your knowledge of the issue, that if Saudi Arabia had not intervened in Yemen, it would now have become a client state and would have been taken over basically by the Iranians?

Mr. CORKER. I don't think that is even debatable.

Mr. MCCAIN. So you agree—

Mr. CORKER. That is correct.

Mr. MCCAIN. Isn't it true that in all conflicts—one of the great tragedies of conflicts is that innocent civilians are slaughtered?

Mr. CORKER. No question. As a matter of fact, we have actually demarched, in some ways, Saudi Arabia because we felt in some ways, using what we might call "dumb bombs," that civilians were being killed in inappropriate ways. They have moved to using other weaponry, smart bombs, and other kind of things to move away from that.

So we don't think Saudi Arabia has been perfect in Yemen. No doubt civilians have been killed. But the facts that you are stating about pushing back against an Iranian proxy are true.

Had they not done that, the country would have fallen into their hands, no question.

Mr. MCCAIN. Could I ask again the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee: Suppose that, unimpeded, the Houthis, the clients of the Iranians, had taken over the country of Yemen. What would that do? Would that, indeed, pose a threat to the Straits of Hormuz, where they are already harassing American naval vessels?

Mr. CORKER. It creates greater instability in a region that already has had tremendous amounts of it. But no question—I mean, it borders the Straits. Again, it puts more of that in Iranian hands, no question.

Mr. MCCAIN. Would it be accurate to state that your committee has held hearings on human rights, your committee has advocated improvements of human rights in Saudi Arabia, and it is the thinking of almost all of us that we want to see more progress in that direction? But at the same time, isn't it true that when we look at what Bashar al-Assad is doing, when we look at the slaughter of 400,000 people in Syria, 6 million refugees, would one assume that maybe this priority of the sponsors of this amendment might be a little bit misplaced?

Mr. CORKER. Look, I was speaking earlier about this issue, which no one knows more about than the Senator from Arizona, but one of the basic national interests that we have in the Middle East is the balance of power.

As you know well, people in our country have been far more reticent to have our own men and women on the ground in the Middle East. I mean, that is just a fact. We know that. If that is the case, then if you have a country like Saudi Arabia that is willing to push back against these efforts which, again, further Iran, it seems to me that we would want to allow them to buy equipment to be able to do that. So it helps us with the balance of power. It helps us with an ally. It helps us push back against Iran, and the thing I know you care so much about is our own readiness in the United States. It also keeps the lines of building equipment open. That could be very useful to us down the road. So I don't understand what policy objective could possibly be achieved by blocking this sale.

Mr. MCCAIN. May I ask one more question concerning the so-called 28 pages that recently have been declassified? Isn't it true that information implicates individual Saudis as having been responsible for 9/11? Isn't it true that no one disagrees with that?

Mr. CORKER. That is correct.

Mr. MCCAIN. But isn't it also true that the Government of Saudi Arabia has not been implicated by these so-called 28 pages that were going to reveal the vast conspiracy that the Government of Saudi Arabia allegedly for years had—the adversaries, shall I say, had alleged that somehow the Saudi

Government was involved in? Isn't it true that the 28 pages show they were not?

Mr. CORKER. That is right. One thing that is sad about this in some ways is that everything you have said is true. But in addition to that, there are some intelligence community affidavits that go on top of these and explain even more fully that that is the case. Yet those documents, because they are classified, likely will not be made available to the U.S. public. But I have seen them, you have seen them, and others here have seen them. There is a huge misunderstanding, if you will, about what these 28 pages contain. Then, what has come after that by other intelligence agencies within our own country further state with even greater strength some of the things that you just said. There is just no evidence.

Mr. McCAIN. So, if this proposal or this piece of legislation were passed, I would ask my friend: What message is sent? What message would be sent, supposing that we voted in favor of this misguided resolution that we are now debating?

Mr. CORKER. I think it sends—

Mr. McCAIN. Not only to Saudi Arabia—

Mr. CORKER. Yes.

No, I think it sends a signal.

Look, I don't think anybody can debate—we have had these discussions in our Foreign Relations Committee. I know you have had them in Armed Services, where you are the distinguished chairman.

I think everyone on both sides of the aisle understands what a blow to our credibility—this is not a pejorative statement—has occurred to us since August–September of 2013. People understand in the region and in the world our credibility has diminished over the redline. This is just sending a signal to people even more fully that we cannot be counted upon; that the objectives we lay out to achieve a balance of power, to help our friends, to counter the nefarious activities that everyone acknowledges Iran is conducting cannot be conducted. It is another stake in the heart about what we value most about our Nation; that is, our credibility to others.

I hope this is defeated.

I appreciate my friend from Kentucky and his feelings about this particular issue. I don't look at this as a proxy for some other issue relative to the declaration of war. That, to me, is a stretch. This is about a direct relationship and other relationships that you are referring to and—basically—demonstrating that we as a nation cannot be counted upon.

Mr. McCAIN. I thank the Senator, the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, for his stewardship of the Foreign Relations Committee, for his in-depth knowledge and advocacy for a strong America and strong alliances.

I think the voice you have added to this debate should have an effect, I

hope, on both sides of the aisle. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. PAUL. Madam President, there is probably no greater issue before Congress at any time in our lives or any time in our service than whether we should go to war. I think it is a mistake to slide into war. I think it is a mistake to allow the power to declare war to default to one person. Our Founding Fathers were very clear throughout the Federalist Papers, explicitly in the Constitution, that the power to declare war shouldn't go to one person; that the power to declare war should be determined by a vote of Congress. We have abdicated that role, and the vote today is a vote over whether we should try to reclaim that power.

Some will say: Well, it is just arms, and if we don't sell them, somebody else will.

Well, you know, I don't think of national security as a jobs program. I don't think of whether we create jobs here at home. I think about the young man who lives down the road from me who lost both legs and an arm, OK? I think about the human toll of war. I think about whether there is a national security interest, but I think nothing at all about whether any jobs are created.

If we make weapons and we have a weapons industry, that is good for our country when we make them for ourselves, but when we are selling weapons around the world, by golly, we shouldn't sell weapons to people who are not putting them to good purpose. What we have found is that Saudi Arabia is an irresponsible ally.

One of the great ironies that nobody here can quite explain is that this body has voted unanimously to let the people of 9/11 sue Saudi Arabia. So we are going to let the person who we think might have had something to do with Saudi Arabia have more weapons? What kind of signal is that to Saudi Arabia?

Would Saudi Arabia be bereft of weapons if we held \$1 billion out? No. We have already sold them \$99 billion worth. They have enough to blow up the Middle East 10 times over. I think it might send them a message.

Do you know what. Stop the sale, send them a message. Do you know what the message might be? Quit funding madrasas that teach hate in our country. Don't tell us you are going to stop doing it.

Saudi Arabia, tomorrow, stop funding madrasas in America that teach hatred, that teach intolerance. Stop putting Christians to death. Stop putting people who convert to Christianity to death. Stop beheading protesters.

The one young man who is a protestor in Saudi Arabia is scheduled to be beheaded and crucified. Does that sound like somebody who is a great ally with a great human rights record?

The young woman who was raped by seven men—she was put in prison. She

was told it was her fault for being alone with the man. She was publicly whipped.

Poets have been picked up around the world and brought back to Saudi Arabia to be whipped for what they write.

Do you trust Saudi Arabia to do the right things with your weapons? These weapons are owned by the American taxpayer. We built them. We did the research into them. Private companies make money off of them, but it isn't about them making money. It isn't about them getting to sell the weapons instead of Russia selling the weapons. It is about our national security.

Saudi Arabia's indiscriminate placement of weapons into the Syrian civil war has led to the rise of ISIS. ISIS grew stronger as Saudi Arabia was flying weapons to al-Nusra, Al Qaeda, and likely some of them to ISIS.

We now have a war in Yemen. Yes, we are directly involved in the war. Yes, this is a vote not just about weapons, this is a vote about whether we should be at war in Yemen. We are refueling the Saudi bombers in midair. Our military planes are, in a sophisticated fashion, refueling their planes. Do you think the Yemenis think: Oh, no big deal. You know, 3,000 citizens have died. When you go to a wedding in Yemen and you get a bomb dropped on you from Saudi Arabia, do you think you have warm, fuzzy feelings for our great ally, Saudi Arabia?

Absolutely, we should be telling Saudi Arabia what to do. These are our weapons. Do you know when they are willing to listen? It is when we argue from a position of strength.

Do you know what is the ultimate weakness? Give them what they want. Giving the arms industry what they want is the ultimate weakness. We look weak, and we look bowed before and cowed before the Saudi Arabians.

As they sit back in their long robes sipping tea, refugees bob about the Mediterranean. People are starving and displaced in Yemen. Not one of them will come to Saudi Arabia, not one of them will be allowed in the country.

Yes, this is a debate about war, and this is a debate about whether you want to be at war in Yemen. It is not just a debate about sending and selling another \$1 billion of weapons, it is about should we be at war in Yemen. It is about should we be at war anywhere without the permission of Congress.

This is not a small occurrence. This is not a small happening. This is a big deal. This is the most important vote that any legislator will ever have. Should we be at war or shouldn't we be at war?

Those who want to make this about a jobs program, about we are going to get some sales of tanks—no, it is not a jobs program. It is about young men and women dying in a war. It is about whether it is in our national interests. It is about whether we are going to be safer. Shouldn't we have a debate over whether the war in Yemen is making us safer?

We certainly should have had a debate about the war in Libya. Did that make us safer? Once Qadhafi was gone, chaos ensued. ISIS controls one-third of Libya after the war as a result of the war.

We are now bombing in Libya. We are bombing the replacement to the government we bombed. So we bombed Qadhafi into oblivion. We don't like the people who replaced him either so we are bombing them. Does anybody think that maybe it is a mistake?

This is what this debate is about. What should American foreign policy be? Should Congress lie down and be a lapdog for the President—let him do whatever he wants? That is what a vote on this will mean if you let the President have what he wants, if you let the arms industry have what they want because they can make a buck selling tanks into a war that is a catastrophe.

In the Wall Street Journal, Simon Henderson wrote that the chaos and violence in Yemen is such that it would be an improvement to call it a civil war.

It is hard to know who is friend and foe. Even our former Ambassador to Syria has said, in Syria, it is almost impossible to know friend from foe.

People have repeatedly written that Saudi weapons in Syria have gone to the wrong people. It is not like: Whoops, Saudi Arabia is sometimes wrong, and they are not that bad. They have a horrific human rights record. There are people who believe them to be complicit in 9/11. This body voted unanimously to let the 9/11 victims sue them, and now this body wants to give them weapons? Does no one sense the irony?

As we move forward on this vote, everyone should understand that this is a proxy vote for whether we should be at war in the Middle East because neither side—the leadership on neither side—will allow a vote on whether we should authorize force. Neither side will let the constitutional debate occur on whether we should be at war.

I see my colleague from Connecticut. Would he like to have the last word?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY. I thank the Senator.

Madam President, I do think this is an important moment. As I said in my opening remarks, I don't think a vote in favor of this resolution fundamentally breaks the alliance with Saudi Arabia.

They remain an incredibly important partner. We will still cooperate with them with respect to other counterterrorism measures. We understand the importance of the role they play in the Middle East with respect to providing some sort of detente between Sunni nations and Israel, but friends also have the ability to part ways. Friends have the ability to call each other out when their friend isn't acting in their interests.

As we have talked about over the course of the last few hours, there is no

way to read the war in Yemen as in our national security interests. There is no way to understand how the growth of Al Qaeda and ISIS inside Yemen, as a result of a bombing campaign that is funded by the United States, is in our national interests.

I hope we have a good vote because I think it will send a strong message to the Saudis that their behavior has to change, but I hope we are able to find other ways where Republicans and Democrats can come together to talk about these issues because Senator PAUL is right. We are not doing our constitutional duty. We are not performing our constitutional responsibility when we acknowledge multiple conflicts in the Middle East that are unauthorized today—when we don't come to the floor of the Senate and do what we used to do, which is debate matters of war and peace.

Maybe war looks different today than it did 20 years ago or 50 years ago or 100 years ago, when conventional armies marched against each other, but this smells, this looks, and this sounds like war. We are providing the ammunition. We are providing the targeting assistance. The planes couldn't fly without U.S. refueling capacity.

We may not be—American pilots may not actually be pulling the trigger to drop the bombs, but we are pretty much doing everything else that is necessary for this war to continue. It sounds like we should have a say, as a coequal branch, as the article I instituted, as to whether this is in U.S. national security interests.

At the very least, by saying it is time to put a pause on these arms sales—which, by the way, are happening at a pace that is unprecedented. There are unprecedented levels of arms sales, not just to Saudi Arabia but to the region at large. By saying it is time to put a pause on arms sales, we send a strong message to our ally, Saudi Arabia, that if the conduct of this war doesn't change inside Yemen, if their continued export of Wahhabism to the world doesn't change, then we all have to rethink this partnership.

Friends occasionally disagree. I think this is a moment of important disagreement. This doesn't fracture the partnership with Saudi Arabia. Ultimately, it may make our partnership stronger.

I thank Senator PAUL for leading us, and I encourage my colleagues to support this resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CORKER. Madam President, I think it would be wonderful to debate many of the things, at any time, that any Senator wishes to debate, but to use this as a proxy for something totally unrelated, to me, is a most unusual way of approaching the other issues that have been discussed.

This has nothing to do with a declaration of war. This has nothing to do with any of those things. This is about whether we want to consummate a

sale, a purchase—an arm's length purchase—between two countries that we have said, as a national policy, would help strengthen our own U.S. national interests.

If we will remember, the President actually convened—by the way, in a bipartisan way, we supported this—convened these countries to share with them that we were going to be willing to expedite the sale of arms to counter Iranian influence in the region and to continue to have the balance of power that is on the ground.

Again, I think, today, based on just the conversations I have had, Republicans and Democrats are going to come together overwhelmingly to table this motion that is definitely, from my standpoint, not in U.S. national interests. I do think what they are speaking to is going to occur. My sense is, there is going to be an overwhelming vote to table this because people realize that while the optics of it—you know, Saudi Arabia, people are wondering about them, which is true—at the end of the day, a vote for this resolution, again, cuts our nose off to spite our face.

We are here to do those things that are in our own country's national interest, and I hope today we will bind together and continue to do that by tabling this motion.

With 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.

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I move to table the motion to discharge and ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the motion to table.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Virginia (Mr. Kaine) is necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Virginia (Mr. Kaine) would vote "yea."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TOOMEY). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 71, nays 27, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 145 Leg.]

YEAS—71

Alexander	Boozman	Carper
Ayotte	Brown	Casey
Barrasso	Burr	Cassidy
Bennet	Capito	Coats
Blunt	Cardin	Cochran

Collins	Hoeven	Reed
Coons	Inhofe	Risch
Corker	Isakson	Roberts
Cornyn	Johnson	Rounds
Cotton	King	Rubio
Crapo	Lankford	Sasse
Cruz	Manchin	Schumer
Daines	McCain	Scott
Donnelly	McCaskill	Sessions
Enzi	McConnell	Shaheen
Ernst	Menendez	Shelby
Feinstein	Merkley	Sullivan
Fischer	Mikulski	Tillis
Flake	Moran	Toomey
Gardner	Murkowski	Vitter
Graham	Nelson	Warner
Grassley	Perdue	Whitehouse
Hatch	Peters	Wicker
Heitkamp	Portman	

NAYS—27

Baldwin	Heller	Paul
Blumenthal	Hirono	Reid
Booker	Kirk	Sanders
Boxer	Klobuchar	Schatz
Cantwell	Leahy	Stabenow
Durbin	Lee	Tester
Franken	Markey	Udall
Gillibrand	Murphy	Warren
Heinrich	Murray	Wyden

NOT VOTING—2

Kaine	Thune
-------	-------

The motion was agreed to.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2017—MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be given 1 minute so I can give a short speech.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NASA LEGISLATION

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, we just passed a NASA bill in the Commerce Committee, and we are going to Mars. We are going to Mars in the decade of the 2030s with humans, and the bill sets the goal of having a colonization of other worlds. This is a new and exciting time in our Nation's space exploration program and particularly now with the human exploration program. I thought that would be good news for the Senate.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. 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.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOMINATION OF DOUGLAS WILSON

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I am on the floor today to raise my concern about another nominee who has been on hold in this body for months. I am sad to say that this has been an ongoing issue with the Senate. People have been nominated—good people who are very well qualified—and then their nomination doesn't get acted upon.

One of those people is Douglas Wilson, who has been nominated to serve

on the U.S. Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy. This is probably a Commission that most people don't even know exists, and yet Mr. Wilson has been on hold since June 13, when his nomination was referred to the floor. He actually was nominated by the President in March.

He is eminently qualified. He is a noncontroversial nominee. The Republican Vice Chairman of the Commission, William Hybl, has urged the Senate to confirm Mr. Wilson, and yet his confirmation remains blocked for reasons that seem completely unrelated to the nominee or his qualifications.

I believe it is time for the Senate to confirm Mr. Wilson so that the Commission can be fully constituted to carry out its important mission. Surely, these days when there are so many hotspots around the world, when there is so much going on, it would be helpful to have the Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy in place and fully staffed up to be able to help advise on so many of the conflicts that we see going on in the world.

Doug Wilson has had a distinguished career of more than three and a half decades in the public and private sector. After graduating from Stanford University and the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, Doug became a Foreign Service officer serving in posts throughout Europe and later with senior positions with the U.S. Information Agency. During the Clinton administration, he served as Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs under Secretary Cohen. Most recently, from 2010 to 2012, he was Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs, serving as a principal adviser to the Secretary of Defense.

He is a three-time recipient of the Department of Defense Distinguished Public Service Award, the Pentagon's highest civilian honor. Since 2013, he has been a senior fellow and chair of the board of advisers at the Truman National Security Project. In 2009, he was the founding chair of the board of directors at Harvard's Public Diplomacy Collaborative. I think there is no question that Doug Wilson is extremely qualified. He has worked in a bipartisan way over the years.

I have had the great pleasure of knowing Doug for more than 30 years. When I first met him, he was a foreign policy adviser to then-Senator Gary Hart. He worked in that role again when Senator Hart ran for President in 1984.

The fact is that the work of the U.S. Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy has never been more important and urgent. One of the great foreign policy challenges of our day is countering the poisonous ideology of violent extremist groups. Another is countering Russian propaganda and Russian meddling in Europe and central Asia. The Commission plays an important role in helping our Nation address these challenges, and we need people with the right experience and the right

judgment to serve on that Commission—people like Doug Wilson.

I am disappointed that this nomination of someone so eminently qualified—someone who has support on both sides of the aisle and from the Republican Vice Chairman of that Commission, Mr. Hybl—continues to remain on hold before this body. I don't know why. For some reason someone has objected to this moving forward. We don't know who that is. We don't know what their objections are.

That is one of the challenges we have in this body that needs to change if government is going to operate the way the people of this country expect.

So I am going to keep coming to the floor. I am going to keep trying to move Doug Wilson's nomination, as I have since June. I am hopeful that at some point the majority will hear these concerns and agree that we should approve him and make sure that this Commission is fully functioning.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be recognized, and following my remarks, Senator CASEY from Pennsylvania be recognized, followed by Senator SANDERS from Vermont, followed by Senator WARREN from Massachusetts, and followed by Senator ALEXANDER from Tennessee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 1878

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, this is somewhat of an unorthodox way to ask for a UC, but we are going to go through a process this afternoon talking about a bill called the Pediatric Rare Disease Priority Review Voucher Act, which expires on September 30 of this year.

All of those names I just mentioned have a stake in this particular debate and I am going to lead it off. Then, I am actually going to refer to my colleague from Pennsylvania, Senator CASEY, my friend and coauthor of this legislation for the purposes of the UC motion, and then we will go from there.

Mr. President, I fell in love with my wife in 1968 and married her 48 years ago. We have had a great marriage. But in 2004, I fell in love with Alexa Rohrbach, the young lady to my left who you can see on the screen here.

Alexa had neuroblastoma, an incurable cancer of the brain. She came to Washington, DC, lobbying us to try to accelerate the research into rare diseases for children and to try to find cures for them. I got interested, and I went to the Children's Hospital of Pittsburgh, PA, where Senator CASEY is so active. I am active in children's health care in Atlanta, and I saw many of the breakthroughs for cancer and other diseases of children. BOB CASEY and I got very interested in seeing what we could do to further the development of new drugs coming into the

marketplace to save lives and make the quality of life better. Such was my desire to be, hopefully, the guy who prompted some researcher somewhere to develop a new program that would research neuroblastoma and would correct it so that Alexa Rohrbach could sit by me today.

Five years after I met her, Alexa Rohrbach died, but my passion for trying to meet the request that Alexa had lobbied for did not go away. It actually burned brighter. So Senator CASEY and I got together and developed the FDA Rare Pediatric Disease Priority Review Voucher Act, and passed it 5 years ago. That bill provided, as an incentive for companies to develop breakthrough drugs, a priority review voucher for future drugs that would incentivize them to work harder to develop new drugs. Such has been the case in a number of things that have happened, and I am very proud that took place.

But that program is expiring September 30. I want to see to it that it is extended. It is an incentive that incentivizes the right thing to happen for the right people for it to happen for, and it doesn't cost the taxpayer any money, but saves lives and it makes their quality of life better.

There will be objections that you will hear from Senator SANDERS and Senator WARREN and maybe others about this—that or the other, in terms of pharmaceutical companies or in terms of trying to do a package of bills together—but there is no reason whatsoever to object to a unanimous consent to adopt the extension for 5 years for this proven program.

Some of those who will object have written letters to the FDA encouraging programs like this to exist—one of them being Senator WARREN from Massachusetts, who on the April 15 of this year signed this letter to the FDA, urging the acceleration of development of a breakthrough drug for Duchenne disease. By the way, on Monday of this week the Sarepta Therapeutics company in Boston, MA, was approved by the FDA for the development of a new drug that is the first drug to treat Duchenne muscular dystrophy, a disease that affects 1 in 3,500 boys who are born, limits the quality of their life, and, in many cases, causes death. That process was developed through the work of a company. We want to make sure that companies are incentivized to make those types of breakthroughs again. There are so many companies where, if given the right incentive and the right opportunity, breakthroughs can be developed. Lives can be saved, and the quality of life can be better.

We will hear all kinds of arguments about pharmaceutical companies, and you will hear arguments about this, that, and the other. The facts of this matter are clear. This bill is an incentive that for 5 years has incentivized the development of new breakthrough drugs to cure diseases and ailments that affect children in America. It is an incentive that is right, it is not an incentive that is wrong, and it works.

Any objection to it for any reason whatsoever—such as that it ought to be included with another package of drugs or that because pharmaceutical companies develop breakthroughs, we shouldn't do it, is a bogus argument.

I will be glad to debate anybody, anyplace, anywhere if you are talking about a philosophical difference, but by golly, I will not debate them about delaying something that can expedite a cure being developed in the United States of America for a disease that kills children.

So when BOB CASEY and I ask for unanimous consent today to approve the bill, it is only approving an extension for 5 years of a bill that is in place and has worked. It doesn't cost the American taxpayer a dime but may save the life of an American taxpayer and their children. That is a good thing for us to be here for. That is the reason I am still here today at age 71. It is to see to it that I make some contribution to the furtherance of health and the quality of life for every child in America.

It is my hope that at some point in time in this debate before we get to the end of the year, those who have adversarial reasons to object to a unanimous consent for an extension of 5 years will come to the reality that we are doing the right thing for the right reasons. It is not partisan. It is not political. It is practical, and it is right.

I publicly want to thank Senator BOB CASEY from Pennsylvania for being my partner throughout this development, and I encourage every Member in the Chamber, when they have the opportunity, to vote for the health of our children, to vote for the extension of their lives, to vote for the development of new cures coming through and the research and development and incentives to cause that to happen.

With that said, I yield to Senator CASEY.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

MR. CASEY. Mr. President, I want to thank my colleague from Georgia for his good work to advance the process. I offer the following consent request:

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 415, S. 1878; that the committee-reported substitute amendment be agreed to; that the bill, as amended, be read a third time and passed; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

MR. SANDERS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. President.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

MR. SANDERS. Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. President, it goes without saying, to pick up on Senator ISAKSON's point, that there is nobody in this body who does not want to see cures as

quickly as possible for the terrible diseases that are taking the lives of children in this country. That is not the debate. Nor I think is it the debate that we need research and development to get us a cure of cancer, to get us a cure of Alzheimer's disease, to get us a cure of diabetes, and so many other diseases that are shortening the lives of people in our country and around the world. We must work together to make that happen.

In my view, if we understand that it is imperative that we try to come up with cures to these terrible diseases, there is no debate, I would hope, that the U.S. Government and institutions like the National Institutes of Health and the Food and Drug Administration must play, as they have historically done, a major role in finding cures for these diseases, easing suffering and expanding life expectancy. I don't think there are too many people here who would disagree with that.

But in order to do that, it is clear that we are going to require a well funded National Institutes of Health and a well-funded Food and Drug Administration. I must say, it is beyond my comprehension that year after year, my Republican colleagues appear to work overtime to provide tax breaks to billionaires yet refuse to adequately fund the NIH or the Food and Drug Administration. What set of priorities can anyone have that makes sense to anybody in this country that says: Yes, we are going to give tax breaks to billionaires and large corporations. But no, we are not going to adequately fund the major institutions in this country that are leading the effort to find cures of the terrible diseases that impact our children, our seniors, and everybody in this country.

I would hope that my Republican colleagues listen to the American people and get their priorities right. Poll after poll says no more tax breaks for the rich. Let's invest in health care. Let's invest in cures for the children's diseases that Senator ISAKSON talked about—cancer, Alzheimer's, and all the rest.

Second of all, just ironically and coincidentally, I just asked through my Web site for the American people to send me information on what is going on in their lives with regard to prescription drugs. Every so often, we do that. We sent out an email, and we do Facebook so they can tell me what is going on with regard to their life and prescription drugs. Not surprisingly, the vast majority of the comments we received—and we received about 1,000 comments from people all over this country—are from people who are outraged by the high costs of prescription drugs in this country—a cost that is going up every single day.

People are walking into their pharmacies today and seeing the price of medicines that they have had for 20 years double, for no explanation other than the fact that the drug companies can do it and are doing it so they can make outrageous profits.

In this country, we pay the highest prices in the world for prescription drugs. Senator ISAKSON talked about the terrible diseases facing our kids. He is right, but do you know that every year there are thousands of people in this country who are dying because they cannot afford to pay the highest prices in the world for prescription drugs, while last year the pharmaceutical industry made \$50 billion in profit? The top five companies made \$50 billion in profit.

One out of five people in this country, Senator ISAKSON, when they go to the doctor's office and they get a prescription, you know what, they can't afford to fill that prescription. Talk to the doctors in Georgia. Talk to the doctors in Tennessee. This is what they will tell you: We write the prescriptions, but working class people can't afford to fill them. We have received letters from oncologists all over this country who tell us their cancer patients cannot afford the outrageously high costs of the medicines people need to stay alive.

Maybe, just maybe, it might be time for the Senate to stand up to the pharmaceutical industry and all of their lobbyists here and all of their campaign contributions and say: We are going to stand with the American people who are sick and tired of being ripped off by the drug companies.

Let me read just a few—I am not going to read 1,000 letters, just a few—to give an indication of what is going on in America.

Mark from Plainville, CT, wrote to us and said that his drug for Crohn's disease went up from \$75 a month to \$700 a month. Is anyone here concerned about that? He is worried that he may die. This is what he writes to me:

I am no longer treating my Crohn's disease. I am in a lot of pain and will eventually develop colorectal cancer and die. I am 39 with a wife and two daughters. We simply cannot afford this medication any longer. I have had to leave my job and I am now trying to freelance from home with no success for 4 months. Our home is about to be foreclosed. Is that of interest to my Republican friends or is that not important?

Amanda from Bartlesville, OK, shared this story of her husband's gout medication:

He pays more than \$300 a month for a medicine that was \$4 in 2010.

Maybe someone can explain to me how a medicine that was \$4 in 2010 is \$300 a month now.

He is now disabled because he cannot afford the medicine he needs.

Heather in Taos, NM, cannot afford her EpiPen. We have heard a whole lot about the high price of EpiPens. She said:

I basically haven't had one in years that is not expired. Just hope I don't get stung or I will die.

John in Anchor Point, AK, cannot afford his insulin, which jumped from \$1,400 to \$1,600. He said:

I skip buying groceries when picking up meds. Went home and scraped by. Sold pos-

sessions to make ends meet so we can buy food.

Jerry from Lincoln, NE, cannot afford Gabapentin for shingles. It was \$35, and it is now \$75.

Trish from New Jersey stopped taking her breast cancer medication because it went from \$25 to \$225 for a 3-month supply. Is anyone concerned about that?

Of course we want new drugs to cure diseases, but those new drugs won't do anybody any good if people can't afford them.

We have seen scandal after scandal in the last few months and years. Gilead sold Sovaldi, a drug for hepatitis C, for \$1,000 a pill. Mylan raised EpiPen prices by 500 percent over the last several years, to more than \$600. Martin Shkreli raised the price of Daraprim, a lifesaving AIDS medication, by 5,000 percent. Are we concerned about that? I hope some of us are.

Above and beyond the fact that the pharmaceutical industry is ripping off the American people, the FDA itself tells us that this voucher approach doesn't work. The Government Accountability Office released a report in March that found that there is no evidence this program works to incentivize drug development. Not only does the program not work, it actually slows down the review time of drugs that are clinically important. When one of these vouchers is used, that means FDA staff must take time away from reviewing priority medication in order to review drugs that have bought a pass to the front of the line. By moving one drug faster, more important drugs may move slower.

What we do know is that these vouchers sell for hundreds of millions of dollars. One recent example from last year is that a drug company, United Therapeutic, sold a priority review voucher to another major drug company, AbbVie, for \$350 million.

While nearly one in five Americans cannot afford to fill their prescriptions, the top five drug companies made a combined \$50 billion in profits last year.

There are many reasons why we pay such outrageous prices, but one reason is we continue passing laws written by the pharmaceutical industry and their lobbyists year after year after year. I believe the American people should know that the pharmaceutical industry has spent more than \$3 billion on lobbying since 1998. How is that? Democracy at work. Drug companies charge us the highest prices in the world, and the pharmaceutical industry spent \$3 billion on lobbying. They are all over this place, high-priced lobbyists trying to get us to pass pharma legislation. Just last year the pharmaceutical industry spent \$250 million on lobbying and campaign contributions and employed some 1,400 lobbyists. Maybe the working families of this country need some protection against these lobbyists.

I certainly want to do everything I can to see that this country comes for-

ward with cures for children's diseases and diseases that impact so many Americans of all ages, but we are going to have to have the courage to start taking on the pharmaceutical industry and representing the American people. So I am offering an amendment, along with Senator WARREN, which I hope will pass, which will extend this program, which is going to expire at the end of September, to the end of the year. That will give us an additional 3 months to work together to come up with some serious legislation that addresses not only children's issues but the health care and needs of millions of Americans in general.

I look forward to working with my friends on the other side to come up with a good solution to protect the American people from the outrageously high cost of prescription drugs in this country.

Reserving the right to object, would the Senator modify his request to include the Sanders amendment which is at the desk?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the modification?

The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Reserving the right to object, as chairman of the Senate Health Committee, I will object, but I will work with the Senators from Pennsylvania, Georgia, Massachusetts, and Vermont to do what we need to do during the rest of the day so that the Senate will be able to adopt an extension of this important program to the end of the year, which I think we should be able to do.

I will reserve the remainder of my remarks until the Senator from Massachusetts has a chance to speak.

I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard to the modification.

Is there objection to the original request?

Mr. SANDERS. Yes, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Massachusetts.

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, I rise in support of Senator SANDERS' objection and amendment. Massachusetts is home to many of the Nation's best scientists and most innovative biomedical companies. I believe we have a moral imperative to save money and save lives by expanding medical innovation in the United States.

I have been here for almost 4 years. I have spent nearly the entire time working both publicly and privately to try to fix the broken medical innovation system in this country. I will be blunt: It has been maddening because we know what we need to do to fix this problem. We know that medical cures come from taxpayer investments in basic research, followed by private industry making its investments to turn that research into viable treatments. Nobody in Congress seriously disputes that.

Every single person I have talked to here says they support increasing funding for the National Institutes of

Health. Yet for over a decade Congress has decimated the NIH's budget. It has effectively been cut by nearly 25 percent. Those cuts are singlehandedly choking off support for the projects that could lead to the next major breakthrough against ALS, Alzheimer's cancer, and rare pediatric diseases. Those cuts are driving scientists out of the country or out of research entirely. Those cuts are discouraging a whole generation of brilliant young researchers who see no path to launch the work that could save millions of lives. Only in Washington can every single elected official say they are committed to fix something and then do nothing.

Newt Gingrich and I do not agree on much of anything, but we teamed up last year to plead with Congress to address this travesty. Newt Gingrich said: "To allow research funding to languish at a time of historic opportunity when you could be saving lives and saving money takes a special kind of stupidity that is reserved for this city." I agree.

For 2 years, Republicans in the Senate have claimed loudly that they want to do something about this. For a year they talked to Democrats about a comprehensive, bipartisan package that would include investments in NIH and FDA. Then one day they stopped talking and instead started pushing a bunch of small, piecemeal bills through the committee, all without a single dime of new money for medical research, and then declared themselves the conquering heroes of medical innovation.

Now, look, I support some of these bills. I helped write some of these bills. Others, like the Advancing Hope Act, I have serious concerns about. But without new funding for medical research, this bundle of bills will not move the needle on medical innovation. The Advancing Hope Act is an example. I support getting more transformative cures for pediatric rare diseases, but the Advancing Hope Act doesn't put a dime of additional money into medical research or approval—not one dime. This bill just hands drug companies vouchers so they can jump to the front of the line at the FDA. The drug companies love it. Most of them have turned around and sold off their vouchers, sometimes for hundreds of millions of dollars. But the FDA has said there is no evidence this program is effective at incentivizing drug development for rare pediatric diseases.

Who knows what breakthrough cancer or Alzheimer's treatment now takes longer to approve because some giant drug company uses a voucher to move something more lucrative but less important to the head of the line. I am not opposed to these vouchers under any circumstances, but without more, these vouchers cynically ask people with diabetes and people with breast cancer to fight the parents of children with rare pediatric diseases over who gets approved first.

I want cures, and to get them, we need to put more money into the NIH so that we can cure more diseases. We need to put more money into the FDA so they can approve everything that is worth approving as quickly as possible.

Senate Democrats have made their position clear. Whatever our views on these individual policies, we do not support moving piecemeal bills without a real, bipartisan agreement on new investments. Every Democrat on the HELP Committee has cosponsored a serious proposal to provide \$50 billion in new mandatory NIH and FDA funding. Republicans have put no proposal on the table—nothing. Chairman ALEXANDER said publicly that he understood the importance of getting this done, but it has been months and we have seen nothing.

The supporters of this expiring voucher program want to extend it to the end of December. I am willing to do that. I will join Senator SANDERS in that.

I believed Chairman ALEXANDER's promise to work in good faith on a bipartisan package that will actually fix medical innovation in this country. Despite months of silence, I still believe it. I want to give him every opportunity to keep that promise.

If Republicans want to ignore the real problems here and play political games instead, if they want to cynically use sick children and desperate moms in the runup to an election as a political football to avoid actually doing the right thing by these families, I cannot stop them, but I will not play along.

We are losing an entire generation of scientists and researchers because Congress will not face the hard fact that medical research takes money. We are forfeiting cures and treatments that could help people all across this country because Congress will not make the investments in basic research. We are losing our mothers, our fathers, our sons, and our daughters because Congress plays politics with people's lives. I will not play along, and I will do every single thing I can to get the funding we need to support real medical innovation in this country.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. First, Mr. President, I congratulate Senator CASEY and Senator ISAKSON for doing a terrific job of being excellent Senators and coming up with legislation a couple of years ago that has helped children.

We have now heard from the only two U.S. Senators in the whole body, so far, who have voted against this bill this year. We have 22 members on our HELP Committee—Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions. We voted to extend this bill another few years because it has been so successful. The vote was 20 to 2.

You just heard from those very eloquent Senators. They don't like Republicans, they don't like drug companies,

they don't like billionaires, and they asked the question: Well, is anybody listening?

I am listening. Whom do we care about? Let's talk about these 7,800 children at St. Jude's Hospital in Memphis. These are children who are very sick. Many of them will die prematurely. Every single one of them has free care at St. Jude's Hospital thanks to the contributions of many people.

This is what the doctors at St. Jude's Hospital say about the proposal Senator ISAKSON and Senator CASEY have made that has been in the law since 2012 and received 20 votes in our committee against the two votes of the Senators who are on the floor.

St. Jude's doctors who are taking care of these very sick children say:

Priority vouchers (PRVs) provide a very powerful incentive to stimulate drug development in rare pediatric diseases.

Does anybody care about these children in Memphis—

These aren't some people in Washington, in bureaucracies. These are doctors caring for dying children.

The doctors continue:

These conditions often lack the market opportunity to attract significant investment, or may present other significant development obstacles and costs that may deter investment from biopharmaceutical companies.

We may not like drugmakers, but if we need new drugs for dying children, who is going to make the drugs if the drugmakers don't make them? Some bureaucrat in Washington? Some committee member of the Senate? No, no—someone who knows how to make drugs.

This proposal that has been on the books for 5 years says that we will provide an incentive to help these children. It has worked. We voted 20 to 2 in our committee—which is about equally composed of Democrats and Republicans—in favor of extending it. It is important for the American people to know that.

According to the doctors at St. Jude's Hospital in Memphis—remember, they have 7,800 very sick children they are caring for today. They say:

We have witnessed strong evidence that the programs are working.

The Isakson-Casey bill is working.

Continuing:

Support for the Voucher Program is key to facilitating access to new agents important to improving outcomes in pediatric cancers.

We have considered this the way U.S. Senators are supposed to. We brought it up in our committee. We debated it. We had amendments when they were offered. We voted on it, and we voted 20 to 2.

The House of Representatives has also considered this legislation. It has enacted this. This would be part of our 21st century cures legislation that we hope the entire Congress will approve before we leave at the end of the year, but the bill expires at the end of this month so we need an extension.

Every day we delay creates more uncertainty in the marketplace and

makes it less likely that some drugmaker is going to create a new drug to help these children. Now, we may not like drugmakers, some of us; we may not like markets, some of us; we may not like Republicans, some of us; we may not like billionaires, some of us, but if the drugmakers don't make the drugs to help these children, who will do it? When we have an entire committee that has worked through this, I think it is very unfortunate that we don't take the time to extend this for a period of time to create the kind of certainty we need.

On the 21st century cures legislation the Senator from Massachusetts, a diligent Senator and a good member of the committee, talked about, apparently, she is not paying much attention to the work we are doing on the bill. It has been my top priority. I have worked on it daily with Senator MURRAY, the ranking Democrat. I have worked with the President and with the Vice President. We have a bill that the President of the United States would like us to pass because it addresses precision medicine, his top priority.

This same bill addresses the Cancer MoonShot, the Vice President's top priority. The Speaker of the House of Representatives is turning somersaults to try to find a way for us to be able to find the money for that, as well as opioids and other important projects we would like to fund. The majority leader of the Senate has said that if we are able to agree on this bill, it will be the most important bill we will pass this year.

We are doing a very good job in our committee of getting to the point where we can actually turn something into law that the President, the Vice President, the Speaker of the House, and the majority leader would all like to see happen. I thank Senator CASEY and Senator ISAKSON for their help in doing this. My hope is that we can work together, finish our work on this, and pass it shortly after we come back in November.

My last point, regarding doing nothing on funding, is that I don't know what budgets people are reading. Let's stop and talk about this a little bit. Let's talk about the Food and Drug Administration.

According to Mercatus, in 2000, the FDA was funded at a little over \$1 billion. In 2015, that number is \$4 billion. We are about to look into a series of agreements next year, which we will have a chance to vote on, that will add billions of new funding to the FDA.

In our 21st century cures legislation, there are provisions to allow the Commissioner of the FDA to recruit and hire more of the talented experts he needs—another reason we need to pass that bipartisan legislation.

What about funding for research in the United States? According to the New England Journal of Medicine, today the United States—both through the government and through our phar-

maceutical companies—spends nearly as much on biomedical research as all of Europe, all of Japan, and all of China combined.

Let me say that again.

According to the New England Journal of Medicine, the United States of America—publicly and privately—spends nearly as much on biomedical research as all of Europe, all of Japan, and all of China, combined. In addition to that, I think the number is about \$32 billion that we now spend through the National Institutes of Health, mostly on biomedical research at major universities.

I try not to spend my time talking about Democrats. I notice my friends on the other side often say Republican, Republican, Republican. I get a little tired of that because we are working together to get something done, but we do have a Republican majority. Last year, it was under the Republican majority that we added \$2 billion to the National Institutes of Health.

Senator BLUNT led that, but I want to give credit to Senator MURRAY, who is the ranking Democrat on that committee, because without Senator MURRAY and Senator BLUNT, it wouldn't have happened. But give Senator BLUNT credit for it, he happens to be a Republican, if we are being partisan about it. How much money is that? That is \$20 billion over the next 10 years.

This year, the same committee, Senator BLUNT of Missouri and Senator MURRAY of Washington, added another \$2 billion for the National Institutes of Health. Over the next 10 years, that is \$20 billion more dollars. We are up to \$38 billion of new money for the National Institutes of Health over the next 10 years.

If anybody has been paying attention to anything I have said over the last 6 months or any of the discussions I have been having with the President, the Vice President, and the House of Representatives in our committee, we have been talking about \$6 billion, \$7 billion, or \$8 billion additional dollars for Cancer MoonShot, for precision medicine, for the BRAIN initiative, for regenerative medicine, and for a number of things that need to be done. This is the most exciting time in biomedical research we have had. What I just added up was \$20 billion, plus \$18 billion, plus \$6 billion or \$7 billion. That adds up to \$44-\$45 billion of new dollars for the National Institutes of Health over the next 10 years.

While it took bipartisan cooperation, let's say it: We do have a Republican majority in the U.S. Senate, and that is our agenda. That is what we want to do. We just don't talk about it in a partisan way because we usually get better cooperation and better results when we give credit to the other side, which I am pleased to do.

Maybe you don't like drug companies. Then who is going to make the drugs?

We are not talking about drug companies today. We are talking about

7,800 children who are very sick at St. Jude's Hospital and receiving free care. Their doctors have told us that if we don't pass the Isakson-Casey legislation for several more years, we are going to make it less likely that these children will live—less likely that they will live. That is what we are talking about.

We could have a big debate about drug companies. We can raise taxes on billionaires. We can talk about Republicans and Democrats. Let's do that another day. Let's get back to business. Let's do our quiet work in a bipartisan way, which is the way we try to do it in our committee and we have done it. We have had 45 hearings. Forty-one of them have been bipartisan hearings where we have agreed on the witnesses. We get more results than about anybody, but we don't get results by making speeches about each other and making speeches about subjects that aren't the real subject of the day. The real subject of the day is 7,800 very sick children at St. Jude's Hospital.

Their doctors are telling us that if we don't continue incentives that are already working, according to these doctors, if we don't provide more incentives to drugmakers to make the drugs for rare diseases that will keep these children alive, then we aren't doing our job.

I thank Senators ISAKSON and CASEY. By the end of the day, I hope we have accepted Senator SANDERS's motion to extend the program until the end of the year.

What I also hope is, when we come back in November, we will have an agreement—as we are perfectly capable of doing—that begins to move treatments and drugs through the FDA more rapidly so they can get into the medicine cabinets and the doctors' offices at a lower cost and more quickly; that we will have several more billion dollars of funding for the National Institutes of Health; that we will focus on the President's Precision Medicine Initiative with some of that money, on the Vice President's Cancer MoonShot with some of that money, on the BRAIN Initiative with some of that money; and that we will give each other a little bit of a pat on the backs for this past year, appropriating \$20 billion more over the next 10 years for NIH and putting another \$20 billion in appropriations bills this year.

I look forward to the end of the day, when hopefully Senator SANDERS' motion will be adopted and the Isakson-Casey program, which has worked so successfully for these children, will be extended for long enough to create enough certainty in the marketplace so drugmakers will make rare drugs to help these children live. Thank you.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GARDNER). The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, let me say to Chairman ALEXANDER, I certainly look forward to working with him over the next several months to

come up with a package that makes certain we do everything we can to cure childhood illnesses, which otherwise would be fatal, but that we also understand it is not just 7,800 beautiful kids in that hospital, but there are millions of people in this country who are suffering today because they cannot even afford the medicine that is on the market at the same time as five drug companies—it is not a question of disliking drug companies. It is a question of fact. Five drug companies made \$50 billion in profits last year, charging our people, by far, the highest prices in the world for medicine. One out of five Americans who are sick cannot afford the medicine they need.

An example, one small example, this is the chart of drug prices in the United States versus Canada, with EpiPen, which is on the front pages today. In the United States, it is \$620; in Canada, it is \$290.

Why are we paying twice as much for the same product as a country 50 miles away from where I live?

Crestor, for high cholesterol, is \$730 in the United States, \$160 in Canada. Premarin, for estrogen therapy, is \$421 in the United States, \$84 in Canada.

Look, I have been around the country in the last year, and there are few Americans—very few—who do not understand that the greed of the pharmaceutical industry is causing terrible health problems for millions of people. I read some examples. There are people who are dying because they can't afford the medicine they need. People are cutting their pills in half, which should not be done.

So I do look forward to working with Senator ALEXANDER in the next couple of months to see how we can, in fact, come up with legislation that begins to address one of the great health care crises facing this country, and that is the high cost of prescription drugs and the need to make medicine available to all of our people at an affordable price.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I see other Senators on the floor who wish to speak, and I will let them do that. Maybe Senator CASEY wishes to conclude.

I look forward to working with Senator SANDERS. He and I have some different points of view, which I guess is obvious, but we can talk about drug companies. We can talk about the fact that one drug company has spent \$3 billion since 1989 on Alzheimer's and is about to offer to the American people a way, for the first time really, to prevent the progression of Alzheimer's, we hope. This is public information currently in clinical trials. Another drug company is about to offer, hopefully, medicine that may actually help Alzheimer's before the symptoms are shown, which would be terrifically important in terms of the grief that we will avoid for Americans and the cost that terrible disease is causing. But that is \$3 billion spent without any

“profit” yet. That is what a marketplace allows. Now, in marketplaces there can be abuses. My point of view is that, generally, what you want to do is have the most amount of competition in the marketplace possible, and that is what we can talk about as we go forward.

I don't think we gain much when we give these speeches about Republicans and Democrats. I don't think people like to hear it; maybe they do. I don't give them, but I am doing it today just because I have heard so much of it from the other side. I don't like it, frankly; I don't like it at all. I mean, I never got a result by talking about my opponents' political party. I never moved an education bill through without giving credit to the other side, and a genuine amount of credit.

I didn't mention that the President himself, with whom I am working on 21st century cures, proposed in his budget to cut the National Institutes of Health by \$1 billion. I could come down here and say that. I could have gone to the committee hearing and said that. I never mentioned it in the hearing because my goal was not to embarrass the President or make a political point. My goal was to see if we could find some consensus to move ahead at the most exciting time of biomedical education. And 20 of the 22 of us voted for this bill.

So I would like to ratchet down the partisan rhetoric. If people want to point out the difficulties with drug companies and with the marketplace and with Republicans and billionaires, there is a time and place for that. But today we are talking about these children—the 7,800 children at St. Jude Hospital. Doctors have told us that if we extend the Isakson-Casey bill for a period of time to give enough certainty so that drug makers will make more drugs to deal with rare diseases, these children will live longer. And 20 of the 22 of us agreed with that, and we would like to see it move forward.

So I am delighted to work with the Senator from Vermont and the Senator from Massachusetts. I am glad we have a temporary solution that will take us through the end of the year, but that is not the best solution because it still provides a lot of uncertainty and will not do as good a job as the doctors say we should do.

I thank the Chair, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, first of all, I want to thank my colleagues for being here today to debate these issues. I appreciate Senator ISAKSON's work with us—Senators SANDERS, WARREN, and ALEXANDER.

I think we agree on two things, believe it or not. No. 1, both sides of the aisle here want to make progress as it relates to curing rare pediatric diseases. That is No. 1. I think there is agreement on that. No. 2, there is agreement to extend the existing pro-

gram, which has already helped enormously to advance that first cause. We are in agreement to extend that until the end of the year. That is a bipartisan agreement. We will work out the details for that, and we will keep working on these issues when we get back.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. FRANKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Democrats control the next 30 minutes and the Republicans control the following 30 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

ST. CLOUD, MINNESOTA, STABBINGS

Mr. FRANKEN. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss the Central States Pension Fund crisis and a proposal to address that, but before I do, I want to take a moment to talk about the horrific events that unfolded in St. Cloud, MN, this past weekend.

The investigation is ongoing, but we know that last Saturday evening a man dressed in a security guard uniform took to the Crossroads Mall in St. Cloud, MN, and senselessly stabbed nine people. Fortunately, they have all been treated and discharged. This was a heinous attack, and I hope that all the victims and their families know that Minnesotans are thinking of them.

Mr. President, I also want to commend the actions of Jason Falconer, the off-duty police officer who bravely stopped the attacker before he could hurt anybody else. If it weren't for him, we could have seen many more injuries and even the loss of life.

I also want to thank the St. Cloud police force and the police chief, William Blair Anderson, who set an example of how to lead during a crisis. I also thank the first responders and the doctors and the nurses for taking care of the victims.

This event has shaken the city of St. Cloud and our entire State. Such senseless and hate-filled acts have no place in our society. Minnesota law enforcement and the FBI are investigating this event to see whether there were connections between the suspect and terrorist groups and what the motivations of the attacker were. We are going to get to the bottom of what happened.

CENTRAL STATES PENSION FUND

Now, Mr. President, I am pleased to be joined by my colleagues to highlight a very important issue, the multiemployer pension system, which is facing severe funding shortfalls, and what that means for hundreds of thousands of retirees who will get their pensions cut if these funds fail.

Over the last year, a number of my colleagues came to the Senate floor to talk about protecting the pensions of the United Mine Workers of America, the miners who toiled for years in dark, dirty, and dangerous mines to power our country. I am pleased the

Committee on Finance has now taken action to begin moving a bill to address that issue.

But today we are here to talk about another group of retirees who face drastic pension cuts. The Central States Pension Fund provides pensions for 22,000 blue-collar workers in Minnesota and nearly 400,000 nationwide. However, it faces a funding shortfall that means those retirees, including elderly workers and widows and the disabled, could face draconian cuts in less than a decade if Congress fails to act.

Mr. President, those who work hard and are promised retirement security ought to be able to retire with dignity. That is a promise Congress made in 1974 when it enacted a law that guaranteed pensions would not be reduced, and that is what workers thought they could count on after years of hard work. But now that promise may be broken.

If we break that promise, workers like Ken Petersen of South St. Paul, MN, will face spending the rest of their lives in poverty. Ken spent 30 years driving trucks as a Teamster before he retired in 2003. If the Central States fund is allowed to fail, Ken and his wife's retirement plans will be shattered and they will face financial uncertainty for the rest of their lives.

It is wrong for us to abandon the blue-collar Americans who earned a modest retirement after a lifetime of work, and I am not going to stand idly by while those workers have their retirement and their dignity taken away from them.

My approach would be to close a tax loophole that no one defends. It is called carried interest and allows Wall Street bankers and private equity fund managers to pay lower tax rates than most of the Central States Pension Fund members who drive trucks for a living pay. Again, to be clear, no one defends this loophole—not Democrats, not Republicans, and neither of their Presidential candidates. And closing it is one way we could help make sure our retirees get the pensions they have earned.

According to the Joint Committee on Taxation, this loophole will cost taxpayers \$15.9 billion over the next 10 years. That is enough to make sure Central States' retirees are able to have a secure retirement, and I think is a much better use of that money than giving an indefensible tax break to a relatively small group of already very wealthy people.

Here is how carried interest works. When most workers, such as those in the Central States fund, earn a paycheck, their income is subject to tax at ordinary income tax rates. But private equity fund managers have been claiming their income is different simply because their job involves managing money. As a result, they pay taxes at the special low rate reserved for capital gains even if they are risking no money of their own. The same is true for managers of hedge funds if, say, a

stock their fund has held for a year—stock bought with their investors' money—is sold for a profit. The manager gets a percentage of the profit, but they pay capital gains on that income even though they didn't risk any of their money.

People who worked hard—like those truck drivers—were guaranteed their pensions would be there. It is up to us to keep faith with those people by closing this loophole. Again, no one defends this.

Let's not forget what happened on Wall Street less than a decade ago. Risky bets by hedge funds, private equity funds, and big banks caused the biggest financial crisis of our lifetimes. And when that happened, Congress bailed out the banks with \$700 billion of taxpayer money.

Today, those banks and private equity funds are back to business as usual, but retirees from funds like Central States, which was fully funded before the financial crisis, haven't received the same support. Instead, they are going to be facing devastating cuts at times in their lives when they can least afford them.

The hypocrisy is clear, but so far, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle haven't been willing to propose real solutions to fix the pension crisis. Instead, they are offering paper solutions that put the burden entirely on beneficiaries or simply kick the can down the road.

We need a real solution, and that is going to require us to take a good look at our priorities. Do we want to continue to subsidize Wall Street or do we want to help the hard-working men and women who dedicated their lives to driving our trucks, keeping us safe, and maintaining our roads?

I think we need to acknowledge that Federal funds are going to be needed to keep the promises made to our retirees. Our Tax Code is riddled with loopholes that could be closed to fix this problem, but let's start with the most obvious and absurd tax loophole. We should close the carried interest loophole that helps private equity fund managers and hedge fund managers, and invest that money in the hardworking Americans whose retirement is being threatened.

I yield to Senator KLOBUCHAR.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I rise today to also speak about the Central States Pension Fund, and I acknowledge my other colleagues speaking on it, Senator FRANKEN and Senator BROWN as well as Senator WYDEN. I appreciate your being here, as well as the ranking member on the Finance Committee.

ST. CLOUD, MINNESOTA, STABBINGS

Mr. President, before I address that, I also want to address the horrific act of violence that occurred at the Crossroads Center mall in St. Cloud. This is a mall that I have been to many times. It is a thriving mall. A lot of people in that area go there, and, in fact, their

sense of safety was shattered that evening. There were 10 victims. At first they thought there were 9 victims, but a video showed there were 10. One is a pregnant woman who was nine months along. By some grace of God, no one was seriously injured, and no one died.

It was terror that I don't think any of us can imagine. People were there with their families shopping, and this happened. The first thing we know is that the mayor and the chief—Mayor Kleis, whom I have worked with for many years, a former Republican legislator who has been a very strong leader of this town, and Chief Anderson, who has been the chief there for many years—have shown that kind of strength in leaders that you would like. Immediately, they came out and explained to the community what happened and told them the honest truth—that they were still gathering the facts. They got the FBI involved, and this is being investigated as a potential act of terrorism. We still do not know all the facts. We hope to have them soon. Mostly, they were able to bring some calm to the community. They were shopping at the mall—I talked to the mayor last night—to show their citizens that they are not going to let this act of violence bring down their town.

We are well aware that ISIS sent out a statement claiming some responsibility. We do not know if that is true. We do know that the FBI is investigating any terrorist connections that this man has had, and we await the outcome of this investigation.

The one thing we do know is that due to the courageous actions of the off-duty officer, Jason Falconer, lives were saved. Because of the good work of the first responders and the reaction of those present at the mall, lives were saved and no one died. This particular officer was there off-duty and had the presence of mind to come to the rescue of all these people, and we thank him for that.

The last thing I would say about this is, talking to the mayor and having been in the community, I know how hard they have been working to bridge divides. There was a beautiful picture in the Star Tribune, and I am sure in the St. Cloud paper as well, about the rally of unity that they had in the community. They have now had two. One was in the college, and the Somali community spoke and strongly condemned this violence in a way that was very heartfelt.

This community is an important part of the fabric of life in our State and an important part of the fabric of life, as Senator FRANKEN knows, in St. Cloud. We will continue to work with them. We thank the mayor, the chief, Officer Falconer, and all those involved for their leadership.

CENTRAL STATES PENSION FUND

Mr. President, back to the issue of the Central States Pension Fund, I was pleased to see that the Finance Committee addressed some retirement and

pension issues today in their markup. We must also address the Central States Pension Fund. I believe that promises made are promises kept.

The promise made to the workers in the multiemployer pension plans like those in the Central States Pension Fund is simple; that is, the pension that they have earned through their decades of hard work will be there when they retire.

Saving for retirement is often described as a three-legged stool—Social Security on one leg, a pension on one leg, and personal savings on another. A stable and secure retirement relies on all three legs being strong, but some multiemployer pension plans are facing funding challenges that could weaken one of those legs.

Over 10 million Americans participate in a multiemployer pension plan and rely on these benefits for a safe and secure retirement. Multiemployer plans are set up as part of a collective bargaining agreement between workers and many employers generally in one industry.

The Central States Pension Fund is such a plan. It was established in 1955 to help truckers save for their retirement. Today, the Central States Pension Fund includes workers from the carhaul, tankhaul, pipeline, warehouse, construction, clerical, food processing, dairy, and trucking industries.

About 70 multiemployer pension plans are facing funding challenges and do not have sufficient plan assets to pay all of the benefits promised. The Multiemployer Pension Relief Act was added to the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2015, in the House. I voted against the Multiemployer Pension Relief Act because I was concerned that this bill would lead to severe pension cuts for our retirees and, in fact, disproportionately impact certain workers in certain States, including Minnesota.

I believe we need to work together to find solutions that maintain the solvency of these multiemployer pension plans without severely penalizing current retirees, active employees, and beneficiaries. I, too, am in favor of closing the carried interest loophole, and I appreciate my colleague's work on this particular solution.

Hundreds of thousands of participants in the Central States Pension Fund still face the real possibility that their hard-earned pensions could be reduced. As I noted, they are mostly in the Midwest. That is why it is called the Central States plan. This affects workers and retirees from these States: nearly 34,000 workers and retirees in Ohio, nearly 31,000 in Michigan, over 21,000 in Minnesota, over 18,000 in Wisconsin, and nearly 1,500 in North Dakota. In fact, seven of the top States in the Central States are Midwestern States.

In September, 2015, Central States submitted a proposal to the Treasury to reduce pension benefits for workers and retirees. Treasury reviewed the

proposal, which would have resulted in benefit cuts for over 270,000 retirees and workers. In May, the workers and retirees narrowly avoided these cuts when the Treasury Department—after going around the country listening to the workers and looking at the plan—rejected the proposal because they felt it did not meet the test under the act.

That doesn't mean this is over. It is far from over. The Central States Pension Fund still faces insolvency by 2025. The current and future retirees could still face cuts. I voted against the act because I was concerned that under this act we might see exactly the kind of cuts that were proposed. What we saw were deep benefit cuts to our workers and retirees, and what we saw was that the size of the potential cuts for the workers, retirees, and beneficiaries was not fairly distributed.

Retirees who are 80 and older and disabled individuals were protected. That was the right thing to do. For everyone else, the possible cuts would leave them with a pension that did not reward their years of work. While many faced cuts of 30 percent, 40 percent, or even 50 percent, I think people would be shocked to learn that over 44,000 people faced pension cuts of over 60 percent and nearly 2,500 people faced possible cuts of over 70 percent.

I do not believe that when my colleagues voted for this, they thought they were actually voting for 70-percent pension cuts, but that actually is the result of that proposed plan. While we understand that there may be changes and that there may be more cuts, or some cuts, there must be a better way to do this than what was proposed.

I heard from people across my State who were trying to figure out how they were going to make ends meet as they faced these drastic cuts. Michael from Shoreview wrote to me about how he was facing a possible cut of 40 percent. Thomas from Sandstone is 71 years old and, after paying into the Central States plan for 30 years, was facing a 60 percent cut. Steve from Maple Grove wrote me to let me know that he is 69 years old and is unable to return to work, but his pension would be cut by 37 percent.

Those are a few examples. Many of these people are in their 60s and 70s, and they should be able to secure in their retirement what they have worked for their entire lives. While we temporarily averted this with the proposal being rejected, we know it is not going to go away. The Central States Pension Fund filed its petition to reduce pension benefits. Since then, an additional eight plans have also filed petitions.

Congress needs to work together to find a bipartisan solution to help pensioners across Minnesota and our country—people who depend on their pensions being there for them in their golden years. We owe it to all Americans who played by the rules and worked hard throughout their lives for a secure pension.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, how much time remains on the Franken-Klobuchar request to speak on this issue?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Ten minutes remain.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I will be very brief. I know Senator BROWN feels very strongly about this, as well, so I am going to make a few remarks and leave time for him. I want to commend Senator FRANKEN and Senator KLOBUCHAR, who have talked to me about this issue many times.

Today in the Finance Committee, with a significant bipartisan vote, we were able to pass the miners legislation to address the health care and retirement needs of those miners. As my two colleagues have pointed out, at its heart, this is the same emergency. Today it is the mine workers. Tomorrow it could be the truckers. The next day it could be the construction workers and the woodworkers in my part of the United States. As my colleagues have said, the reason that is the case is that for generations of Americans, getting a good-paying job came with a simple bargain: You worked hard, you earned a wage and benefits, and those benefits wouldn't be taken away.

Today, bit by bit, that bargain is crumbling. There are two points that I would touch on so that Senator BROWN can have some time, if his schedule permits. I think Senator KLOBUCHAR has made a very good point about how important it is that Congress address this issue because, with respect to troubled systems like Central States, Congress is partially responsible for creating the problem.

As Senator KLOBUCHAR noted, 2 years ago Congress passed a bill—a bill that I was very much opposed to—the Multiemployer Pension Reform Act. It was slipped into a must-pass government funding package, and it gave a green light to slashing benefits in a lot of struggling multiemployer plans. In effect, for a generation of workers, it said: Sorry, times have changed. The benefits that you earned are no longer going to be protected, and the weight of this economic transformation in America is going to fall on you.

It wasn't fair and it wasn't practical. I certainly share the view of my colleagues who said it was a good thing Treasury rejected the proposal that would have cut benefits earlier this year. Obviously we are going to have to take more steps to shore up the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, which is a financial lifeline for 10 million workers, and we are going to have to look at a variety of approaches.

I very much share the views Senator FRANKEN spoke about, which Senator KLOBUCHAR supports as well, when he talked about this rotting economic carcass known as the Federal Tax Code and how unfair it is to working families. My colleagues have just pointed out one example.

Let me say that at the heart of the bipartisan tax reform proposals I have written over the last decade is my sense that we now have a tax code that really represents a tale of two systems. If you are influential and well connected, you can pretty much decide what kinds of taxes you are going to pay and when you are going to pay them. A fortunate few basically have that kind of opportunity. But the people my colleagues have been talking about—for example, truckers—don't have a tax code like that. Once or twice a month, those truckers have taxes extracted from their paychecks. They see it on their paychecks. There are no loopholes or anything that states about whether it is carried interest or derivatives or half a dozen other things; they just have their taxes extracted and there are no writeoffs or any kind of figuring out what you are going to pay and when you are going to pay it. It comes right off your paycheck.

We have a lot of heavy lifting to do. Today, it seems to me that Congress began the task. I can tell my colleagues that there is so much work to do to modernize these pension and retirement systems.

Chairman HATCH agreed to a proposal that I made today to allow people to contribute to their IRAs after they are 70½ years old. That proposal was adopted, as Senator FRANKEN may know, sometime in the early 1960s. I won't pretend to be anywhere near as humorous as my colleagues, but I finally said—I thanked Chairman HATCH for adopting my proposal that let's people over 70½ contribute to their IRAs because people are living longer and feeling better. It doesn't seem that it makes much sense to have so many Senators and working Americans younger than the retirement laws that were adopted for a different time.

We have a lot to do. First and foremost, we have to shore up Central States. We will be looking at a variety of approaches on how to do that, and, as both of my colleagues have said, a fundamental part of what we are going to have to do is fix this broken tax system.

When I start talking about the Tax Code as a rotting economic carcass, my wife always says: Will you just stop there, dear, because you are frightening the children? We have small children. The reality is, this Tax Code is infected with loopholes and the inversion virus. It just goes on and on.

As my colleagues have said, it is not right for working families—particularly those who are depending on Central States pensions—to sort of hang in suspended animation, hoping that somehow there is going to be a piece of legislation that will pass through here so that they will get something resembling what they were promised—a dignified retirement based on the pension they earned.

I commend my colleagues for doing this. This comes at the end of the day

where at least we began the long push to pension reform with a successful bipartisan effort on miners, but, as my colleagues have said, this work has just begun.

I thank Senator FRANKEN and Senator KLOBUCHAR for their commitment and their eloquence.

I yield the floor.

Mr. FRANKEN. Mr. President, 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. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 10 minutes as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, it has now been 4 months since the U.S. Treasury did the right thing and rejected the Central States Teamsters pension fund plan to cut the premiums they had earned through a lifetime of hard work. That was a win for all of us who urged Treasury to reject these cuts. Most importantly, it was a win for the thousands of retirees who worked so hard to protect what they had earned. However, that win did not solve the underlying issue. It was not even close to the end of this fight. It was the first necessary step. The Central States Pension Fund is still in the red and on a path where in a few short years it will be unable to pay out the benefits it owes to our retirees.

If a pension fund is in bad shape, it is our job to fix it, not to break promises to Americans who have worked their whole lives to earn those pensions. This is retirement security these Teamsters have worked for, fought for, and sacrificed raises for.

I remind my colleagues—especially those who spend much of their effort here fighting organized drives for unions, oppose any effort to strengthen unions, and attempt to pass legislation to weaken unions—that at the negotiating table time and time again since the Wagner Act passed 75 years ago, workers have given up wages in order to fund pensions and health care in their later years. That is good for them, it is good for their families, it is good for their communities, and it is good for our society because it means they are prepared in their older years and won't rely on the State to keep them going. Of course, they still get Social Security and all of that, but they are prepared because they have given up wages today for benefits in the future. We should applaud them instead of criticizing the UAW, the Teamsters, and the steelworkers for their “legacy costs.”

These are pensions that they gave up health care packages for and were

promised they would earn over a lifetime of hard work. Just ask Rita Lewis. She is a friend of mine from Westchester, OH, in southwest Ohio. She knows a thing or two about hard work. Her husband Butch worked as a trucker for 40 years with the promise that the pension he earned would be there to care for his family after he retired. When the pension came under threat, he worked to protect it for himself, his beloved Rita, and hundreds of thousands of other Teamsters. Rita has been left to continue Butch's fight alone. He passed away on New Year's Eve due to a stroke, which some have attributed, at least in part, to the stress he faced in fighting for his Teamster brothers and sisters in support of their pensions.

Butch told us that the cuts being forced on retirees amount to a war against the middle class and the American dream, and he was right. That war has already claimed enough victims.

We used to have a compact in this country that promised that if you work hard, play by the rules, and do what people expect you to do, you will be able to spend time with your grandchildren and not worry about how to make ends meet. Workers have more than held up their end of the bargain. It is time for both parties to come together and hold up our end before we leave town.

This Senate, as we have heard repeatedly, has not done its job. Under Leader MCCONNELL, this Senate has been in session less than any Senate in the last 60-plus years. It is simply not doing its job. We are not doing what we should on Zika. We are not doing what we should on the coal miners' pension. We are not doing what we should on Central States. We are not doing what we should to confirm a Supreme Court Justice. It will be the longest time since the Civil War that a Supreme Court spot has been vacant.

We owe it to our constituents on this one and on others not to leave town but to support a bipartisan, long-term solution to protect the benefits they earned and they were promised. This fix needs to be sustainable from now into the future, not the piecemeal plan that addresses problems with current policy but does nothing to solve the underlying issues.

Our Teamsters and their families need the peace of mind to know this nightmare is finally behind them. We need a plan that is bipartisan so we can get this done.

I was encouraged this morning when we held a markup on a plan to deal with the mine workers' pension, which is also under threat. We have had some good bipartisan work to find possible solutions to this crisis. We need the same spirit of cooperation on behalf of our Teamsters.

My wife and I live in Cleveland, OH, in ZIP Code 44105. The ZIP Code where my wife and I live, in 2007, had more foreclosures in the first half in 2007 than any ZIP Code in the United

States. I drive through this neighborhood and there are still far too many homes boarded up, still far too many families dislocated, still far too many children just pulled from one school district to another.

The pages sitting here—I assume most of them have pretty stable lives, where they are able to go to school year after year with the same friends, same classrooms, same schools, same teachers, but think about it. What we all do on this floor we are all paid well for. We have good benefits. For some reason, we don't think other Americans should have the same health care benefits we do, and that is a whole other issue. We don't think enough about people who struggle, who might have their house foreclosed on, who might have been evicted. We don't think about those kids who go from one school district to another. We don't think about these Teamsters families. You are 65 years old and you are retiring. You have planned your life in a way that your Social Security—\$1,100, \$1,200 \$1,300 a month—your retirement pension from the Teamsters, from Central State, you have calculated that. You know you are not going to be rich, but you are going to be comfortable enough, and you start having sleepless nights thinking about what is going to happen to your pension.

Lincoln used to say he wanted to get out of the White House. Staff said: Stay here. Win the war. Free the slaves. Lincoln said: No, I have to get out of the White House and get my public opinion baths. Pope Francis exhorted his parish priests to go out and smell like the flock, with all the Biblical connotations of that.

In this body, we don't think very much. We don't go enough to a labor hall or to a church basement or to a veterans hall and just sit there and listen to people's problems.

The person who sat at this desk right before I did was Jay Rockefeller, the Senator from West Virginia. He used to go out by himself with no media and spend 2½ hours speaking to the miners in West Virginia. He said: I learned to listen to them with soft nods and soft eyes, to really listen and look in their eyes and pay attention to what their lives were like. He was a Rockefeller and had no financial struggles, but he recognized he needed to talk to people who did.

That is whom I want my colleagues to think about, not to go to another fundraiser at a fancy restaurant or spend their time at a country club in Dallas or wherever they live but instead start thinking about what these Teamsters' lives are like, when they expected this pension and are not getting it. Think about these widows of mine workers, understanding that mine workers are more likely to die younger from illness or from dangerous work or from injury than most workers in this country and certainly younger than Senators. Think about those mine

workers' widows who might lose their pensions because the Republican leader in this body doesn't like unions and he doesn't like the mine workers and he has blocked us from doing this. This is not personal. I was just on the stage with Senator McCONNELL. He is a nice man. I like him, but he is not doing his job. The Senate is not doing its job to take care of these workers who have huge numbers of veterans among the Teamsters, a lot more than there are veterans in the U.S. Senate.

We have a lot of work to do, and we shouldn't be leaving here without doing our jobs.

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. STABENOW. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOMINATION OF MERRICK GARLAND

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, it has been 189 days since President Obama nominated a distinguished jurist, Merrick Garland, to the U.S. Supreme Court.

I know there are a lot of issues on people's minds every day because they are working hard and taking the kids to school and putting food on the table and all of the hard work that goes on every day for families, and sometimes talking about the Supreme Court may seem a little abstract to people. I want to speak a little bit about why Americans should care, beyond the fact that we all care about the fact that we have three branches of government under our Constitution, and we need them all fully functioning.

That was the point of our Founding Fathers, to make sure we had three functioning branches, and right now we have one that is not fully functioning. In fact, when they sit, starting October 3, there is going to be a vacant chair because we will not have fulfilled the responsibility of the U.S. Senate of confirming someone for that ninth seat.

Why does that matter to people? Well, over our lifetimes, great debates have gone on about quality education and equal access to schools regardless of where a child lives. It is very important not only for children and for families but for an economy that can function and a country that can function.

Very important decisions have been made that affect every neighborhood in America, every family in America. We have seen issues related to equality in the workplace and in housing and access to credit, if you want to buy a house or you want to start a business. We have seen a whole range of issues that directly affect all of us. Frankly, the third branch of government, as we know, is a check on us, a check on Congress, and on the Presidency to make sure we have the watchdog looking at what we are doing from the lens of the

U.S. Constitution and our Bill of Rights, and making sure we are all living up to that document that is the cornerstone of our country.

So the Supreme Court matters. What happens matters.

Years ago, in 1937—I don't think any of us were here; if we were, we weren't very old at that time—but there was a case called *West Coast Hotel v. Parrish*. It happened in 1937. Elsie Parrish worked as a maid in Washington State and she sued to be paid the \$14.50 a week she was owed under the Washington State law. Her case made it all the way to the Supreme Court, and it was settled in a 5-to-4 decision. Obviously, it was a very close vote, and without that majority, we wouldn't have a minimum wage today. That was decided by the U.S. Supreme Court in a 5-to-4 decision.

Today we all understand that everybody who works hard every day ought to be able to be above the poverty line. I certainly believe that, and we certainly have much to do to make sure our minimum wage keeps up, but if we didn't have that case, people would have a much lower standard of living. We wouldn't necessarily have a minimum wage that sets a floor for everyone's wages in America, as well as addresses equal pay as it relates to wages across the country.

There are so many ways in which the Court impacts our lives. We have had multiple health care decisions, certainly, as it relates to the Affordable Care Act and whether we will have competitive health exchanges so people can purchase insurance at lower rates, and whether we are all in this together so that if we all have insurance, then we are able to have important policies fulfilled, such as no preexisting conditions, so that if you have cancer or your child has diabetes or you have had a heart attack or some other chronic disease, you can purchase health insurance. This is all tied up in implications from Court decisions that relate to health care, and multiple other decisions that relate to health care, and whether 20 million people who now have health care in our country would be having health care if it were not for a Supreme Court decision or decisions as it relates to health care policy.

So workers and families across America need nine Supreme Court Justices. We need to make sure that when October 3 comes along and the picture is taken of the U.S. Supreme Court, there is not a vacant seat here.

We have heard Justice Kagan, for example, who said: A tie does nobody any good. Presumably, we are here for a reason. They are there to resolve cases that need deciding and answer hotly contested issues that need resolving. They can't do that with a tie vote.

The fact is, unfortunately, the Republican majority is refusing to even give Judge Garland a hearing despite the fact that he has been praised over the years by Members on both sides of the aisle for his integrity and his commitment to the judiciary. It makes one

wonder why it is that this seat is being left open. There can be really only one conclusion, and that is that the seat is being left open for the Republican nominee, even though Republican colleagues are stepping away at every turn from the comments made by the nominee and distancing themselves. They are basically saying: We think the Republican nominee should make that appointment. Even though he has no respect for the judiciary, they believe he should be appointing the new Supreme Court Justice. That can be the only conclusion as to why we would see the majority waiting right now. I realize it makes no sense. We will see the third branch of government effectively go for a year, maybe more, without being able to fully function because of people not being willing to do their job because they are waiting to have Mr. Trump fill that seat. I find that embarrassing and extremely concerning for all of us.

It is time for Senate Republicans to do their job. It is very simple. We all have a job to do. None of us would be able to just tell our employer that a major part of our job is something that we just don't feel like doing for a year, so we are not going to do it. We could say that, but when I talk to people about that, they say: Yeah, chances are I would be fired. I certainly wouldn't be paid if I didn't do my job. Yet here, despite our constitutional responsibility to fill that spot, the Senate Republican majority is not doing its job.

Doing our job doesn't mean we have to vote yes. We can vote yes; we can vote no. You can vote yes or no in a hearing, yes or no on the floor. But we have a constitutional responsibility to consider a nominee from the President, to meet with him, to consider his record, to ask questions, to have a hearing, to have a vote, and then people can vote yes or no. You can vote yes or no, but we do have an obligation to vote.

From my perspective, there is no way I can explain to people back home in Michigan why that seat has been left open for any valid reason, unfortunately, other than politics, and that is just not good enough when it comes to fulfilling our job and making sure the third branch of government can fully do its job.

Mr. President, I am calling on the Republicans to hold a hearing. We still have time to hold a hearing, and we can hold a vote before we leave. This is a choice by the majority—a conscious choice—but there is time to hold a hearing and there is time to have a vote so that when October 1 comes, there will be the full nine U.S. Supreme Court Justices sitting, ready to do their job.

Do your job. That is what we need to have happen.

Thank you, Mr. President.

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.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SPECIAL IMMIGRANT VISA PROGRAM

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I have come to the floor today to once again urge that we extend the Special Immigrant Visa Program for Afghan interpreters who put their lives on the line while serving alongside Americans in Afghanistan. Unless we act, Congress is going to let this program lapse in just a matter of months. We will abandon thousands of Afghans who helped our men and women on the ground during the long conflict in Afghanistan. It is no exaggeration to say that this is a matter of life and death. Afghan interpreters who served the U.S. mission are being systematically hunted down by the Taliban, and we must not abandon them.

The United States promised to protect these Afghans, who served our mission with great loyalty and at such enormous risk. It would be a stain on America's national honor to break this promise. It would also carry profound strategic costs. U.S. forces and diplomats have always relied on local people to help us accomplish our mission. We continue to need this assistance in Afghanistan. We need the support in other places in the future. So we have to ask why anyone would agree to help the United States if we abandon those who have assisted us in the past. That is exactly why the former commander of U.S. Forces in Afghanistan, GEN David Petraeus, and his predecessor, GEN Stanley McChrystal, have pleaded with Congress to extend the Afghan SIV Program.

In a recent letter to Congress, more than 30 prominent generals, including Gen. John Allen, the former commander in Afghanistan; GEN George Casey, the former commander in Iraq; and two former Chairmen of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, GEN Richard Myers and GEN Hugh Shelton, also urged the Congress to extend the program.

In addition, our soldiers and marines are very interested in protecting the interpreters who served with them in Afghanistan. Many of them owe their lives to the interpreters who went into combat with them.

In recent years, I have gotten to know former Army CPT Michael Breen. He is a Granite Stater who served with the infantry in Iraq and led paratroopers in Afghanistan. He speaks with admiration about one interpreter in particular, an Iraqi woman in her early twenties named Wissam. On one occasion, Captain Breen and his soldiers were at a small forward operating base in Iraq. A man approached them, frantically pointing to his watch and indicating an explosion with his hands. The Americans didn't speak Arabic, so they couldn't tell if the man was trying to warn them or threaten them.

Wissam hurried toward Captain Breen to assist. Wissam was beloved by her American comrades, always cheerful and always willing to help. She listened to the man and said that he was warning of an IED on the main road.

Captain Breen later said: "A trusted interpreter can be the difference between a successful patrol and a body bag." He noted that every night he and his fellow soldiers would hunker down in their heavily guarded perimeter, but Wissam would leave the compound and go home. One evening after she left the American compound, three gunmen ambushed her car. She was killed—one more interpreter who paid the ultimate price for serving the American mission.

Captain Breen later said: One day there will be a granite monument with the names of all the American servicemembers who died in Iraq and Afghanistan. Wissam deserves to have her name on that monument because she took great risks and gave her life while serving the United States.

As many of our colleagues know, the SIV Program allows Afghans who supported our mission and faced grave threats as a result to seek refuge in America. To be eligible, new applicants must demonstrate at least 2 years of faithful and valuable service on the ground with Americans. To receive a visa, they must also clear a rigorous screening process that includes an independent verification of their service and then an intensive interagency security review.

A typical example is an Afghan interpreter who served with U.S. forces from 2008 to 2015. Because he is in danger, I am not going to use his name. Last December, he was gravely wounded in an IED attack that robbed him of one eye and it destroyed his vision in the other. He applied for a special immigrant visa after being wounded, and he is in the early stages of the interagency vetting process. But unless Congress acts, there may not be a visa available for him once he completes that vetting.

We know that the service of these individuals has been critical to our successes in Afghanistan. In some cases recipients of special immigrant visas have continued to serve the U.S. mission after arriving in this country. One promptly enlisted in the U.S. Armed Forces and later worked as a cultural adviser to the military. Another graduated from Indiana University and Georgetown. He has worked as an instructor at the Defense Language Institute. A third, who worked as a senior adviser in the U.S. Embassy, now serves on the board of a nonprofit, working to promote a safe and stable Afghanistan.

These many contributions help explain why senior U.S. commanders and diplomats have urged Congress to extend the Afghan SIV program. Appearing last week at a Senate Armed Services Committee hearing, Army Chief of Staff GEN Mark Milley added strong support. Speaking of Afghan interpreters he said: "Those are brave men

and women who have fought along our side and there are American men and women in uniform who are alive today because a lot of those Afghans put their lives on the line.”

At that same hearing, Marine Corps Commandant Gen. Robert Neller also stressed the importance of the program and the need for Congress to extend it. Their view is shared by our senior diplomats.

Ambassador Ryan Crocker, who served in Afghanistan from 2011 to 2012 recently wrote:

Taking care of those who took care of us is not just an act of basic decency; it is also in our national interest. American credibility matters. Abandoning these allies would tarnish our reputation.

Well, I agree. Indeed, I think there is overwhelming bipartisan support in both houses of Congress for extending the Afghan SIV program. Yet, because of the opposition of a handful of Members, Congress, by default, could allow this program to expire in a matter of months. This would put in jeopardy the lives of thousands of Afghans who have served alongside our fighting forces.

Make no mistake, it would also jeopardize our reputation as a country that keeps its promises and stands by those who assist our missions. In past years, Senators have overwhelmingly supported the authorization of additional special immigrant visas for Afghan interpreters.

On both sides of the aisle, we have agreed that it is important to make good on our promise to these Afghan allies. But sadly, this year has been different. Several Members have objected. It is evident to me that the anti-immigration passions that have been stoked during this Presidential campaign by Donald Trump have contributed to this impasse.

The irresponsible rhetoric about immigrants is offensive to American values and it ignores what makes America great. Across nearly four centuries, immigrants have brought their energy and talents to our country, building the most successful and dynamic economy on Earth.

Our Nation has always been welcoming to immigrants. In fact, all of us here are immigrants, unless we are Native Americans. We should be especially welcoming to those who served alongside American soldiers and marines in combat and have been so essential to carrying out our mission in Afghanistan.

The Iraq and Afghan Veterans of America and other organizations representing hundreds of thousands of veterans of the U.S. Armed Forces recently addressed a letter to Members of Congress. In that letter, they respectfully but forcefully urged Congress to reauthorize the special immigrant visa program.

I want to quote from this letter, because I think it reflects the words of these American veterans:

Military service instills in a person certain values: Loyalty. Duty. Respect. Honor. In-

tegrity. . . . Breaking our word directly violates these values. Many of us can point to a moment when one of our foreign allies saved our lives—often by taking up arms against our common enemies. . . . Since our first days in boot camp, we accepted and practiced the value: “leave no one behind.” Keep our word. Don’t leave anyone behind.

If we fail to extend the SIV program, Congress will have one more opportunity and only one more opportunity this year. That opportunity will come in the session following the election.

We must seize this opportunity to do the right thing for our country and for the Afghan interpreters whose lives are at risk. We would never leave an American warrior behind on the battlefield. Likewise, we must not leave behind the Afghan interpreters who served side by side with our warriors and diplomats. We made a solemn promise to these brave people. I am going to do everything I can to ensure that we keep this promise.

I urge my colleagues, when Congress returns in November, to join me on a bipartisan basis for a program that has had bipartisan support. We can extend the Afghan Special Immigrant Visa Program. We must do that. It is in our national security interests to keep this promise that we have made.

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.

Mr. LEE. 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.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. LEE. 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.

DIXON POLICE DEPARTMENT SAFE PASSAGE INITIATIVE

Mr. DURBIN. In the last 2 years, I have spoken with so many Illinoisans about the heroin and prescription opioid epidemic. I have heard many different perspectives, including those from law enforcement, health care providers, criminal justice systems, the pharmaceutical industry, Federal oversight agencies, parents, loved ones, and recovering addicts.

I have learned that there is no town too small and no suburb too wealthy to avoid this crisis of addiction and overdose. Opioids and heroin are affecting communities all across the country.

Last November, I travelled to Dixon, IL, to learn about their work to combat the scourge of prescription opioid misuse. That is where I met chief of po-

lice Danny Langloss of the Dixon Police Department, who is leading an innovative effort with the Lee County Sheriff’s Department to address this problem.

Chief Langloss told me that the town had experienced a spike in opioid overdose deaths, which was quite uncommon for the area. As a result, the Dixon Police Department launched a new plan, one that was unconventional for law enforcement, but had proven to be effective in other parts of the country.

They started the Safe Passage Initiative, a program that promotes treatment alternatives to arrest and incarceration. The police department put the word out that, if residents suffering from addiction came forward for help and turned in their drug paraphernalia, they would be assisted in finding addiction treatment rather than being arrested, so long as they did not have outstanding warrants. This program is a model for other communities. It embodies the public health approach to this epidemic that views substance abuse as a disease and not purely a criminal matter.

Well, what has happened? Immediately after the announcement, the police department had dozens of residents come forward, asking for help. They were provided with social services and rehabilitation options. Since the program’s initiation, the Dixon Police Department has helped to place more than 100 individuals into treatment. This is quite the cause for celebration, especially in a small, rural community where it can be incredibly difficult to find open treatment slots. Months later, many of these local residents are now clean and on the path toward recovery.

What else has happened? Crime is down, and the jail cells are not nearly as full as they once were. Rather than arresting addicts for petty crimes that feed their addictions, they are being steered towards long-term help.

Today I would like to celebrate the 1-year anniversary of this program and commend the Dixon Police Department, Chief Danny Langloss, and their partners in the treatment and advocacy community who have helped to make this program a success. The program has now expanded to multiple neighboring counties, including Whiteside County and Livingston County. When we talk about this opioid epidemic and the need for all stakeholders to step up and do their part, the Safe Passage Initiative is a worthy effort that is helping to turn the tide.

Today there is a network of more than 145 police departments and 300 treatment centers that are taking this commonsense approach to addressing the opioid crisis.

It is true that real barriers remain. I know that the Dixon Police Department struggles at times to find available beds for individuals that come forward to their program. And that is why

I am working to expand access to addiction treatment by removing an old Medicaid rule, known as the IMD exclusion, which will help more people get the care they need. I am also working to increase funding for treatment centers and have succeeded in changing Federal regulations so that more individuals can receive effective treatment services.

Across our Nation, there are an average of 77 drug overdose deaths each day. In Illinois, we experienced approximately 1,700 heroin and prescription opioid overdose deaths in 2014, a 29 percent increase from 2010. With the leadership of the Dixon Police Department and the dedication of its partners, we will help make a difference for those suffering from addiction. I congratulate them on the 1-year anniversary of the Safe Passage Initiative and look forward to greater success and expansion across the State in the future.

TRIBUTE TO ROBERT JORDAN

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, Sunday, September 25 marks the end of an era. After 43 years of covering the news in Chicago, Robert Jordan will officially anchor his last newscast on "Chicago's Very Own" WGN 9. Mr. Jordan, an Atlanta native, is unique in journalism. Instead of moving from market to market, he landed with WGN in 1973 just 3 years into his career and never left the city. Outside of a 2-year stint as a Midwest correspondent for CBS, Mr. Jordan was a WGN fixture.

Mr. Jordan has enjoyed a reputation of being a serious anchor and reporter while maintaining a sense of humor for the lighter moments. Since 1995, Mr. Jordan has been coanchoring the weekend newscasts with Jackie Bange. Video of their secret handshakes during commercial breaks has gone viral, with one such clip earning more than 7 million views on YouTube.

In 2014, Mr. Jordan was named as the first journalist-in-residence for the University of Chicago's Careers in Journalism, Arts, and Media program. At the time of announcement, Mr. Jordan told an industry reporter that he was "eager to work with young journalists and help guide them at this challenging time in our profession." There is no doubt those students had a tremendous opportunity to learn from one of the best, but those students weren't the first to learn from Mr. Jordan. His daughter Karen followed in his footsteps and now is a news anchor at WLS 7 in Chicago. Mr. Jordan's son-in-law Christian Farr is a reporter at WMAQ 5, so delivering the news to millions of viewers in Chicago truly has become the family business.

Mr. Jordan's work in education was a natural fit for a man who earned a Ph.D. in philosophy of education with a minor in ethics from Loyola University

Chicago in 1999 after receiving degrees from Northeastern Illinois University and Roosevelt University.

Before he picked up a microphone, Mr. Jordan served our Nation as a surgical assistant in the U.S. Army. He continues to serve through his role on the boards of several community organizations.

With retirement providing some free time on the weekends, Mr. Jordan said he plans to go to fun events with his wife, Sharon, that he missed out on while working. He is also going to continue his work with the Greater Illinois Chapter of the Alzheimer's Association on a unique program called the Memory Preservation Project. Mr. Jordan interviews people who are newly diagnosed with Alzheimer's for the project and creates a video of cherished family memories before the wretched disease robs victims of their ability to recall events in detail. With a new person being diagnosed with Alzheimer's every 67 seconds, there are many families affected by this terrible disease.

Mr. Jordan has promised to turn up from time to time when WGN needs him to fill in for a colleague, but Sunday is truly the end of an era in Chicago journalism.

I wish a happy retirement to one of "Chicago's Very Own," Robert Jordan.

VERMONT PRIDE RETURNS AN ICONIC BUILDING HOME

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, Vermonters have long believed that the preservation of our history, from buildings to manuscripts to celebratory traditions, inform the present and future as much as they honor the past. Last month, the people of Orleans County, in Vermont's rural Northeast Kingdom, came together to restore an historic school house to its original location. What makes this story all the more remarkable is that the physical journey to return the schoolhouse was undertaken by a team of 40 oxen assembled by residents and chapters of the 4-H.

It was Alexander Twilight's vision, as headmaster of the school, to have a central school in every Vermont county that would bring together and educate Vermont's students from neighboring towns.

Born and raised in Corinth, VT, Alexander Twilight studied at Middlebury College and became the first African American known to have graduated from a U.S. college or university. An active community member, Twilight was not only an educator, but also served as a local minister and politician.

In Vermont, we take great pride in being a forward-thinking State. This progressive nature dates back to the mid-1800s, pre-American Civil War, when the town of Brownington in Orleans County was an intellectual hub in

New England. Twilight, and his beloved Orleans County Grammar School, have become a symbol of these times.

The recent move of the schoolhouse by the pulling of a team of oxen, coaxed on by area children as they walked beside the team, would surely have delighted Mr. Twilight. I ask unanimous consent that an August 2, 2016, article from The Burlington Free Press, "1823 school to move by oxen to original site," be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Burlington Free Press, Aug. 2, 2016]

1823 SCHOOL TO MOVE BY OXEN TO ORIGINAL SITE

(By Sally Pollak)

An 1823 schoolhouse will be returned to its original site Monday when 40 oxen pull the Orleans County Grammar School one-third of a mile down Hinman Settler Road in Brownington. The journey by oxen will take the school from Brownington village to a neighborhood of historic and educational significance.

The school will return to its place near the Old Stone House Museum, a four-story building that was constructed in 1836 to be the school dormitory. The granite dormitory, called Athenian Hall, was built by Alexander Twilight, who served as the school's headmaster from 1829 until a stroke in 1855. Twilight died two years later.

Twilight, who was black, grew up in Corinth and graduated from Middlebury College in 1823. He was the first African American person to graduate from a college or university in this country, according to Middlebury and other sources.

"Alexander Twilight actually imagined that this was going to become a big center of learning," said Peggy Day Gibson, director of the Old Stone House Museum. "When he built the Old Stone House as a dorm in 1836, I think he envisioned that this was the first big building. He felt that a central school, a really good institution in every county, was the way to go."

The school fell into disuse after the Civil War, the school's account book indicates. It appears the school did not operate from 1865 until 1870, Gibson said. By then, it had moved from its location at Prospect Hill into the village center, Gibson said.

"It was more convenient" to have the school in the village, Gibson said. The relocation was in keeping with a trend to de-centralize education, a movement that was opposed by Twilight when he served in the Vermont Statehouse, according to Gibson.

Twilight's election to the Vermont Legislature in 1836, representing Brownington, made him the nation's first black elected official.

"Alexander Twilight thought education is better served if you have a very high quality central school," she said.

But local towns, including Barton, Craftsbury, Derby and Glover, began to establish their own schools. "One by one these towns got their own schools," Gibson said. "They took back their kids and their tax money."

STUDENTS FROM BROWNINGTON AND BEYOND

In Twilight's life, Orleans County Grammar School educated students from

Brownington, surrounding farm towns, and Quebec. The dormitory housed 50 students, boys and girls. Twilight and his wife, Mercy Twilight, housed 11 female students on the top floor of their house across the way.

Students moved to the grammar school after attending one room schoolhouses in their villages through eighth grade. Under Twilight's direction, Orleans County Grammar School taught students from grades nine through the first two years of college. The school offered classes in Greek, Latin, trigonometry, physics, chemistry and other subjects, Gibson said.

As its curriculum expanded, Twilight saw the need for a dormitory—a building that bears a striking resemblance to Painter Hall at Twilight's alma mater. The building, which opened as a museum in 1925, has Twilight's signature on the back of a fourth-floor door.

Twilight was a teaching principal who also served as minister of the Brownington Congregational Church. Services were held on the second floor of the school before a church was built in 1841. The church and the school (in its original site) were on either side of the town green.

Moving the school back to this place will enable the historical society to tell the story of a region more fully and accurately, Gibson said.

"There has always been this desire of the Orleans County Historical Society—which owns and manages the museum—to try to get the neighborhood back to its (original) configuration," Gibson said. "To tell the story, the history, it will be great to have the school back here."

The enclave of historic buildings in Brownington includes the former home of Samuel Read Hall, a colleague of Twilight's at Orleans County Grammar School. Hall taught at the school and was, according to Gibson, the country's first teacher-educator.

Hall founded the first teacher training school, which was in Concord. He was the author of the first training manual for teachers published in this country, "Lectures on School Keeping," Gibson said. Hall succeeded Twilight as headmaster.

(The museum purchased Hall's house in 2005, and restored it in 2008. It is used for a variety of events, including on Monday a barbecue for the oxen teamsters.)

"This was a really happening, intellectual vibrant neighborhood, all built during the 1820s and 1830s," Gibson said. "It was a center of progressive education in New England. This was the main road, the stage route, between Boston and Montreal, and this is what was happening."

TOWN GIVES SCHOOL TO HISTORICAL SOCIETY

Last year at Town Meeting, the people of Brownington voted to give the grammar school to the Orleans County Historical Society, according to Gibson and the town clerk.

Terms of the gift include the building's continued function as a community gathering place. The Brownington Grange, for example, has met on the second floor of the building since 1874, and will continue to do so at the new site, Gibson said.

With the addition of the school, Orleans County Society Historical Society now owns seven historical buildings in Prospect Hill, built from 1823 to 1841. The Brownington neighborhood is on the National Register of Historic Places, Gibson said.

The 40 animals that will move the school Monday come from 4-H groups in Randolph and North Haverhill, New Hampshire, and from local residents, Gibson said.

Messier House Moving from East Montpelier will move the building onto the road. The oxen will get hitched to the old school, and start walking.

"If the oxen can pull it up the road, it will be smooth as silk," she said. "This is performance art."

S.J. RES. 39

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, despite my longstanding concerns about Saudi Arabia's record on human rights, and political and religious liberties, this resolution of disapproval would undermine America's relationship with a key security partner in the Middle East while doing nothing to address critical threats in the region. The Obama administration's disastrous nuclear deal and ransom payments to Iran have emboldened the regime's leaders to sow discord and instability in the Middle East, undermining the trust of our Sunni Arab partners, including Saudi Arabia. In its quest for regional hegemony, Iran is attempting to encircle Saudi Arabia by supporting operations in Iraq, Lebanon, Syria, and Yemen; yet this resolution does not address Iran's role in any of these conflicts, including Yemen, where Houthi elements have forced the elected government from Yemen's capital. This conflict is hindering our ability to combat ISIS and al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula.

I urge the Saudi-led coalition to make every effort to protect civilians in Yemen, and I urge the Obama administration to continue assisting the coalition in limiting civilian casualties through targeting and other measures. But Iran must cease its direct and indirect support for those causing chaos and instability in Yemen. Rather than empowering our partners and standing up to our enemies, this resolution would send the wrong message at a time when our partners are already doubting American commitment and resolve.

VOTE EXPLANATION

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I was necessarily absent for the rollcall vote on passage of H.R. 5985 due to my appointment by President Obama as representative to the 71st Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations. I am in full agreement with the Senate's unanimous approval to extend expiring authorities of the Department of Veterans Affairs. Had I been present, I would have joined my colleagues in voting yea.

ARMS SALES NOTIFICATION

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act requires that Congress receive prior notification of certain proposed arms sales as defined by that statute. Upon such notification, the Congress has 30 calendar days during which the sale may be reviewed. The provision stipulates that, in the Senate, the notification of proposed sales shall be sent to the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

In keeping with the committee's intention to see that relevant informa-

tion is available to the full Senate, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the notifications which have been received. If the cover letter references a classified annex, then such annex is available to all Senators in the office of the Foreign Relations Committee, room SD-423.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEFENSE SECURITY
COOPERATION AGENCY,
Arlington, VA.

Hon. BOB CORKER,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, we are forwarding herewith Transmittal No. 16-46, concerning the Department of the Air Force's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance to the Government of Japan for defense articles and services estimated to cost \$1.9 billion. After this letter is delivered to your office, we plan to issue a news release to notify the public of this proposed sale.

Sincerely,

JAMES WORM
(For J.W. Rixey, Vice Admiral,
USN, Director).

Enclosures.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 16-46

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended

(i) Prospective Purchaser: Government of Japan.

(ii) Total Estimated Value:
Major Defense Equipment* \$1.5 billion.
Other \$0.4 billion.
Total \$1.9 billion.

(iii) Description and Quantity or Quantities of Articles or Services under Consideration for Purchase: The Government of Japan requested the sale of four (4) KC-46 aerial refueling aircraft. Each aircraft is powered by two (2) Pratt & Whitney Model 4062 (PW4062) Turbofan engines. The sale includes one (1) additional spare PW4062 engine. Each aircraft will be delivered with Global Positioning Satellite (GPS) capability and defensive systems installed plus spares, to include: Raytheon's ALR-69A Radar Warning Receiver (RWR), Raytheon's Miniaturized Airborne GPS Receiver 2000 (MAGR 2K) to provide GPS Selective Availability Anti-Spoofing Module (SAASM) capability, and Northrop Grumman's AN/AAQ-24(V) Large Aircraft Infrared Countermeasures (LAIRCM) Nemesis (N) system. Each LAIRCM system consists of the following components: three (3) Guardian Laser Terminal Assemblies (GLTA), six (6) Ultra-Violet Missile Warning System (UVMWS) Sensors AN/AAR-54, one (1) LAIRCM System Processor Replacements (LSPR), one (1) Control Indicator Unit Replacement, one (1) Smart Card Assembly, and one (1) High Capacity Card.

Major Defense Equipment (MDE):

Four (4) KC-46 Aircraft including one (1) spare PW4062 turbofan engine.

Twelve (12) MAGR 2K-GPS SAASM Receivers.

Five (5) AN/ALR-69A RWR Systems.

Sixteen (16) GLTA AN/AAQ-24 (V)N; includes four (4) spares.

Thirty-six (36) UVMWS AN/AAR-54; includes twelve (12) spares.

Eight (8) LSPR AN/AAQ-24(V)N; includes four (4) spares.

Non-MDE: Twelve (12) AN/ARC-210 U/VHF Radios, six (6) APX-119 Identification Friend

or Foe (IFF) transponders, initial spares and repair parts, consumables, support equipment, technical data, engineering change proposals, publications, Field Service Representatives, repair and return, depot maintenance, training and training equipment, contractor technical and logistics personnel services, U.S. Government and contractor representative support, Group A and B installation for subsystems flight test and certification, and other related elements of logistics support. The total program cost is estimated at \$1.9 billion.

(iv) Military Department: Air Force (X7-D-SAJ).

(v) Prior Related Cases, if any: None.

(vi) Sales Commission, Fee, etc.: Paid. Offered, or Agreed to be Paid: None.

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology Contained in the Defense Article or Defense Services Proposed to be Sold: See Annex attached.

(viii) Date Report Delivered to Congress: September 21, 2016.

*As defined in Section 47(6) of the Arms Export Control Act.

POLICY JUSTIFICATION

Government of Japan—KC-46A Aerial Refueling Aircraft

The Government of Japan requested the sale of four (4) KC-46 aerial refueling aircraft. Each aircraft is powered by two (2) Pratt & Whitney Model 4062 (PW4062) Turbofan engines. The sale includes one (1) additional spare PW4062 engine. Each aircraft will be delivered with GPS capability and defensive systems installed plus spares, to include: Raytheon's ALR-69A Radar Warning Receiver (RWR), Raytheon's Miniaturized Airborne GPS Receiver (MAGR) 2000 (2K) to provide GPS Selective Availability Anti-Spoofing Module SAASM capability, and Northrop Grumman's AN/AAQ-24(V) Large Aircraft Infrared Countermeasures (LAIRCM) system. Each LAIRCM system consists of the following components: three (3) Guardian Laser Terminal Assemblies (GLTA), six (6) Ultra-Violet Missile Warning System (UVMWS) Sensors AN/AAR-54, one (1) LAIRCM System Processor Replacements (LSPR), one (1) Control Indicator Unit Replacement, one (1) Smart Card Assembly, and one (1) High Capacity Card.

The Major Defense Equipment (MDE) items are the aircraft and engines, MAGR 2K with SAASM, ALR-69A RWR, GLTA, UVMWS, and LSPR. The total MDE cost, with spares, is estimated at \$1.5 billion.

The following non-MDE items will be included with the purchase of the four (4) x KC-46A airframes: twelve (16) AN/ARC-210 UHF Radios, six (12) APX-119 Identification Friend or Foe (IFF) transponders, initial spares and repair parts, consumables, support equipment, technical data, engineering change proposals, publications, Field Service Representatives' (FSRs), repair and return, depot maintenance, training and training equipment, contractor technical and logistics personnel services, U.S. Government and contractor representative support, Group A and B installation for subsystems, flight test and certification, and other related elements of logistics support. The total program cost is estimated to be \$1.9 billion (includes all MDE and non-MDE values and above and below the line charges).

This proposed sale contributes to the foreign policy goals and national security objectives of the United States by meeting the legitimate security and defense needs of an ally and partner nation. Japan continues to be an important force for peace, political stability, and economic progress in the Asia-Pacific region.

The proposed sale increases Japan's capability to participate in Pacific region security operations and improves Japan's na-

tional security posture as a key U.S. ally. This proposed sale will provide Japan a needed capability to a close ally and support U.S. security interests in the region.

The proposed sale of this equipment and support does not affect the basic military balance in the region.

The principal contractors on the sale are Boeing Corporation as the aircraft manufacturer, supported by Raytheon Company, Waltham, MA, as the manufacturer of ALR-69A and the MAGR 2K. Northrop Grumman Corporation, Rolling Meadows, IL, will also support the sale as producer of the AN/AAQ-24(V)N LAIRCM system. Final assembly and delivery of the KC-46A takes place at Boeing's production facility in Everett, Washington. At this time, there are no known offset agreements proposed in connection with this potential sale.

Japan will have no difficulty absorbing these aircraft into its armed forces.

There is no adverse impact on U.S. defense readiness as a result of this proposed sale.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 16-46

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act

Annex Item No. vii

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology:

1. The AN/AAQ-24(V)N Large Aircraft Infrared Countermeasures (LAIRCM) is a self-contained, directed energy countermeasures system designed to protect aircraft from infrared-guided surface-to-air missiles. The system features digital technology and micro-miniature solid-state electronics. The system operates in all conditions, detecting incoming missiles and jamming infrared-seeker equipped missiles with aimed bursts of laser energy. The LAIRCM system consists of multiple Ultra-Violet Missile Warning System (UVMWS) Sensor units, Guardian Laser Transmitter Assemblies (GLTA), LAIRCM System Processor Replacement (LSPR), Control Indicator Unit Replacement (CIUR), and a classified High Capacity Card (HCC), and User Data Modules (UDMs). The HCC is loaded into the CIUR prior to flight. When the classified HCC is not in use, it is removed from the CIUR and placed in on-board secure storage. LAIRCM Line Replicable Unit (LRU) hardware is classified SECRET when the HCC is inserted into the CIUR. LAIRCM system software, including Operational Flight Program is classified SECRET. Technical data and documentation to be provided are UNCLASSIFIED.

2. The set of UVMWS Sensor units (AN/AAR-54) are mounted on the aircraft exterior to provide omni-directional protection. The UVMWS Sensors detect the rocket plume of missiles and send appropriate data signals to the LSPR for processing. The LSPR analyzes the data from each UVMWS Sensor and automatically deploys the appropriate countermeasure via the GLTA. The CIUR displays the incoming threat.

a. The AN/AAR-54 is a small, lightweight, passive, electro-optic, threat warning device used to detect surface-to-air missiles fired at helicopters and low-flying fixed-wing aircraft and automatically provide countermeasures, as well as audio and visual warning messages to the aircrew. The basic system consists of multiple UVMWS Sensor units, three GLTAs, a LSPR, and a CIUR. The set of UVMWS units (each KC-46 has six (6)) are mounted on the aircraft exterior to provide omni-directional protection. Hardware is UNCLASSIFIED. Software is SECRET. Technical data and documentation to be provided are UNCLASSIFIED.

3. The AN/ALR-69A Digital Radar Warning Receiver (RWR) is the latest in RWR technology, designed to detect incoming radar signals, identify and characterize those sig-

nals to a specific threat, and alert the aircrew through the RWR System display. The system consists of external antennae mounted on the fuselage and wingtips. The ALR-69A is based on a digitally-controlled broadband receiver that scans within a specific frequency spectrum and is capable of adjusting to threat changes by modifications to the software. In Country Reprogramming RWR capability will not be provided as part of this export. Hardware is UNCLASSIFIED. Software is SECRET. Technical data and documentation to be provided are SECRET.

4. Miniature Airborne Global Positioning System Receiver 2000 (MAGR 2K) with Selective Availability Anti-Spoofing Module (SAASM). The MAGR 2K design is a GPS Receiver Applications Module based open system architecture that is modular in design and incorporates modem electronics. The MAGR 2K is a form, fit, and function backward compatible replacement of the MAGR, and provides enhancements including improved acquisition and GPS solution performance, all-in-view GPS satellite tracking and GPS integrity monitoring.

5. If a technologically advanced adversary were to obtain knowledge of the specific hardware and software elements, the information could be used to develop countermeasures or equivalent systems which might reduce system effectiveness or be used in the development of a system with similar or advanced capabilities.

6. This sale is necessary in furtherance of the U.S. foreign policy and national security objectives outlined in the Policy justification. Moreover, the benefits to be derived from this sale, as outlined in the Policy Justification, outweigh the potential damage that could result if the sensitive technology were revealed to unauthorized persons.

7. All defense articles and services listed in this transmittal are authorized for release and export by the U.S. Government to the Government of Japan.

25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE INDEPENDENCE OF ARMENIA

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, today we recognize the 25th anniversary of Armenia's independence. On this day each year, we come together to celebrate the strength and indomitable spirit of the Armenian people.

For the last 25 years, Armenia has been a key friend and trusted ally of the United States. It is an alliance between our two nations that will only continue to deepen in the years ahead.

Armenia has come a long way to free itself from terror and tyranny—from the Soviet Union and from the horrors of genocide. This journey continues today, with our shared responsibility to ensure that the Armenian people are able to build their own independent and prosperous future. It is our duty to continue to stand with Armenia and with all Armenian people around the globe as they continue this fight.

We must keep pushing for truth and never allow the forces of denial to succeed in suppressing our collective memory. We have a responsibility to ensure that the evil that was perpetrated upon the Armenian people is never concealed nor denied. We must heed the words of Pope Francis that it is our duty to continue to honor the memory of those Armenians who perished in the Armenian genocide.

I am proud to stand with my colleagues in the Senate to commemorate Armenia's independence and continue to support the Armenian people.

200TH EDITION OF THE FARMERS' ALMANAC

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, since the first edition in 1818, the Farmers' Almanac has become an American institution, an informative and entertaining mix of weather, agriculture, humor, and common sense. With the 2017 issue now in print, it is a pleasure to recognize the 200th edition of this venerable publication and to celebrate Maine's remarkable Geiger family that makes it possible.

For its first 137 years, the Farmers' Almanac was published in Morristown, NJ. In 1955, Ray Geiger, who became the almanac's sixth editor in 1934, moved operations to Lewiston, ME, believing—quite correctly—that my State's New England heritage better reflected the publication's guiding ethic of sustainable, simple living.

Ray Geiger led the Farmers' Almanac for 60 years, its longest serving editor. Upon his passing in 1994, his son Peter took the reins after 15 years as associate editor. That same year, Sandi Duncan was named managing editor, the first woman almanac editor in American history.

Under this leadership team, circulation has grown from 86,000 in the 1930s to more than 4 million today. In addition, the almanac's timeless qualities have stepped into the age of technology with an engaging, interactive website and a Facebook page with more than 1 million followers.

Readers enjoy the Farmers' Almanac for its humorous essays, trivia, and advice on everything from gardening to relationships, but the long-range weather forecasts remain its hallmark. The time-tested, highly secret mathematical and astronomical formula produces 16-month forecasts for seven different U.S. climate zones with a significant record of accuracy. In fact, the CEO of a major airline recently confirmed that Farmers' Almanac forecasts are factored into his company's winter contingency planning.

From the first edition to today, Farmers' Almanac editors have worn the honorary title of Philom—for Philomath, a lover of learning. That is an apt title for readers as well as editors, as every edition of the almanac is a mini-encyclopedia of American history, natural science, and a host of other disciplines.

It is a particularly apt title for Peter Geiger, a great champion of education who founded the Adopt-A-School movement in Maine in 1988 and who launched a successful program with Maine elementary and middle schools to encourage and develop young writers. His company provides college scholarships to Maine students, and Peter serves as a member and former chairman of our State's board of edu-

cation. In 1991, he was named the 618th of President George H. W. Bush's 1,000 Points of Light.

The Geiger family and their company advance the Maine business tradition of service to others by supporting a wide range of civic and charitable endeavors, from the arts to health care to homeless youth. The New Beginnings Ann Geiger Center in Lewiston, ME, named in honor of Peter's mother, provides vital education and skills-development opportunities for homeless and neglected youth. Ray Geiger Elementary School in that same city recognizes the family's many contributions.

The special 200th edition of the Farmers' Almanac includes a celebratory section of vintage articles that take readers through nearly two centuries of American lore, from how to quiet a fussy baby with molasses and feathers to the art of kissing and maintaining household tranquility. Just as important, it stands as proof that hard work, an entrepreneurial spirit, and a commitment to giving back are the key ingredients of success. I congratulate the Geiger family and the Farmers' Almanac for this milestone achievement and wish them all the best in the years to come.

TRIBUTE TO DR. SUSAN S. KELLY

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, today I wish to pay special tribute to an exceptional Federal civil servant of the United States of America, Dr. Susan S. Kelly, the director of the Transition to Veterans Program Office, Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness. Dr. Kelly is retiring from the Federal Government on September 30, 2016, after 33 years of distinguished service to our Nation. Many of us on Capitol Hill have enjoyed the opportunity to work with Dr. Kelly on a wide variety of defense issues and programs, and it is my privilege and honor to recognize her many accomplishments.

Dr. Kelly has an extensive history of helping organizations successfully transform, and I want to focus on her exceptional work since she took over as the director of the Transition to Veterans Program Office in June 2012. She has been instrumental in the ambitious effort to revitalize the Department of Defense Transition Assistance Program, which ensures that servicemembers transitioning to civilian life are provided with the information and training needed to effectively pursue their civilian career goals. In implementing the sweeping redesign of the Transition Assistance Program, she has helped the military move away from viewing transition as an end-of-career activity, instead making postmilitary preparation a careerlong process that servicemembers plan for throughout their military life cycle. She has also helped to transform the Department's views on transition, emphasized the essential skills that make the all-volunteer force an attractive

pathway to employment, and strengthened a talent pipeline that returns career-ready servicemembers to communities across America. It was the first redesign and comprehensive review of the Transition Assistance Program in the 20-plus years since it became law.

At every turn, Dr. Kelly sought to ensure that the Transition Assistance Program is not only effective but also efficient. Dr. Kelly implemented a stronger oversight of program budgetary processes and sought to use smarter, more efficient processes in redesigning the Transition Assistance Program. Dr. Kelly has also led several changes to prevent unnecessary redundancy within the Department, including relying on existing assets for certified financial planners, educational counselors, and resiliency trainers. In addition to eliminating redundancies, this has fostered collaboration with other Department of Defense agencies and, for this work, was recognized in 2015 as a finalist in the management excellence category for the Samuel J. Heyman Service to America Medal, which honors stars of the Federal Government's workforce.

Dr. Kelly's work on behalf of the Transition to Veterans Program Office, the Department of Defense, and, most importantly, our Nation's servicemembers demonstrates her dedication to the cause of changing the culture within the Department to better help our Nation's veterans succeed. With Dr. Kelly's guidance, this dramatic and sweeping transformation of the Transition Assistance Program has been implemented throughout the Department of Defense, enabling the Department to ensure that today's veterans are better equipped than ever to handle an ever-changing labor market every bit as well as they were able to handle the ever-changing challenges of the battlefield.

As Dr. Kelly concludes her 33-year career as a public servant and leader in a highly demanding department, she is to be recognized this day as a most distinguished American for her exemplary leadership, commitment, managerial talent, and vision.

On behalf of the Congress and the United States of America, I thank Dr. Susan S. Kelly and her entire family for the commitment, sacrifices, and contributions they have made throughout her honorable service. Congratulations on completing an outstanding and successful career.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

REMEMBERING BRIAN SCOTT GAMROTH

● Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, Wyoming has lost a true giant. On September 18, 2016, Brian Scott Gamroth lost his life in a tragic motorcycle accident. It is hard to think of a more familiar and friendly voice in Wyoming than Brian Scott's. For the past 23

years, the Casper community woke up and went to work with the smiling voice of Brian Scott filling the airwaves on the K2 Morning Show. While his voice has been silenced, his impact on Wyoming will live on.

Brian didn't stop at just reporting about the community, he lived it and loved it every day. If there was a charitable event in Casper or anywhere in Wyoming, Brian was either emceeding it or letting everyone in the Cowboy State know how they can help. Through his talents as an entertainer, master of ceremonies, and a community leader, Brian has raised millions of dollars for local and State charities.

Brian's love for Wyoming was only eclipsed by his love for his family. He is survived by his wife, Tracy, and three sons: Josh and his wife, Heidi; Kyle and his wife, Whitney; and Corey. Brian cherished his four grandchildren, Lucy, Sarah, Reagan, and Owen.

Brian Scott Gamroth was a friend to everyone. He has changed many lives for the better, and Wyoming will feel his loss for a long time. Bobbi and I are blessed to have called him our friend. We will miss him dearly.●

TRIBUTE TO TOM PAYNE

● Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, earlier this year, I got the news that my good friend, Dean Tom Payne, had announced that he would be retiring from the MU College of Agriculture, Food, and Natural Resources and vice chancellor for Agriculture. Needless to say, I had mixed emotions.

I am happy that Tom will get to spend more time with his beautiful wife, Alice, and his children, Joanna and Jacob, and Jacob's wife, Jennifer. Of course, I am also happy that Caroline and Jack, his grandchildren, will get to see him more.

However, his retirement also made me think that someone will have big shoes to fill because Dean Payne has set high standards throughout the years and exceeded them.

Dean Thomas L. Payne has served as vice chancellor for Agriculture and dean of the MU College of Agriculture, Food, and Natural Resources since January 1, 1999. Back then he knew that the College of Agriculture at the University of Missouri in Columbia was a leader in agriculture research and education. Today under Dean Payne's leadership, the MU College of Agriculture is at the forefront.

Dean Payne was born in Bakersfield, CA. He received his B.A. in zoology from the University of California, Santa Barbara, and his M.S. in entomology and Ph.D. in entomology and physiological psychology from the University of California, Riverside.

Payne took his talents to Texas A&M University's departments of entomology and forest science. He started his track record in leadership, academics, and research.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture selected him to serve as the research

coordinator for the Southern Pine Beetle Program.

He became a professor and head of entomology at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University.

In the midnineties, Tom was appointed as associate vice president for agricultural administration and associate dean for research at the Ohio State University's College of Food, Agriculture, and Environmental Sciences. He was also the director of the Ohio Agricultural Research and Development Center.

He then moved to the University of Missouri, Columbia and further solidified his leadership in research and academics. In addition to serving as vice chancellor and dean of the MU College of Agriculture, Food, and Natural Resources, he also became the director of the Missouri Agricultural Experiment Station. The Missouri Agricultural Experiment Station is a network of centers conducting research in agriculture, animal science, natural resources, and forestry.

Of course, Dean Payne is an over-achiever. He is the author and co-author of more than 130 publications and is founding coeditor of the *Journal of Insect Behavior*. He is a recipient of numerous awards including the Alexander von Humboldt Prize and Missouri Future Farmers of America Association Distinguished Service Award. If all that wasn't enough, Dean Payne has been a member of the World Agricultural Forum's Board of Advisors, Danforth Plan Sciences Center's Board of Advisors, Agriculture Future of America's Board of Directors, and a board member of the Entomological Foundation.

There are few people who are able to figure out what they love to do and make such a successful career out of doing just that. However, Dean Tom Payne is one such person who has had a career doing what he loves, but in addition, have a tremendous impact on students, peers, and all those that know him.

Dean Payne has had a career preparing, showing, teaching, and leading students and faculty. I am confident that there are many individuals who would credit Dean Payne for their interest in agriculture, especially agriculture research. He has always had a passion for what he does—and not matter what, he always has his wit and humor.

I have seen his wit and humor bring tears and laughter. I have also seen individuals nervous as they waited to hear Dean Payne speak, wondering what zingers he might say. I can promise you, he knows how to hold his audience's attention—students or career professionals.

My friend, Dean Tom Payne, has always provided insight and leadership at each institution he worked, committee seat he held, and board on which he served. I know that at the College of Agriculture, Food, and Natural Resources, at the University of Missouri

in Columbia, Dean Payne has left his mark on the student population, research programs, and faculty members. Student enrollment in the college increased by 44 percent. Student participation in study abroad programs increased 50 percent. He contributed to making the Bond Life Sciences Center a reality. Plant and animal sciences continued to enhance its programmatic strength, so it is now ranked among the 15 best programs in the world. And he oversaw the hiring of more than half of the college's current faculty.

Again I say, Dean Payne has left big shoes to fill.

In his retirement, I am confident Dean Payne will play more golf, but I am not certain it will improve his game. He might even do some more hunting and fishing. I hope he will continue to be a resource for those in agriculture, especially agriculture research and education.

Missourians wish Dean Tom Payne all the best in his retirement.●

REMEMBERING DALE FREEMAN

● Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, today I wish to honor the life of Lawrence County Judge Dale Freeman of Portia, AR, who passed away on Saturday, September 17, 2016.

Judge Freeman was a Lawrence County native who loved his neighbors and community with evident passion. Dale graduated from Southern Baptist College and worked at Burlington Northern Railroad, where he retired after 36 years of service. He also had a desire for public service and went on to become mayor of Portia, AR, and eventually was elected judge of Lawrence County in 2010.

Judge Freeman once told a reporter, "the only job I ever wanted was to be the judge in Lawrence County." When the people of Lawrence County gave him that opportunity, he made the most of it. He was a tireless advocate for citizens and was known to put in long hours conducting the business of the county. His ultimate goal was to leave the county better than when he took office, and based on the results, it is fair to say that he achieved that aim.

Judge Freeman was injured in a car accident in August of this year and was being treated at a hospital in Little Rock. While he had been making progress toward a recovery, unfortunately, his health rapidly declined, and he passed away as a result of his injuries. He is survived by his wife, Mary, daughters, Tonya, Candi, and Michelle, and son, Jeff.

I deeply admire Judge Freeman's dedication to serving his lifelong home of Lawrence County. I know his leadership, dedication, and commitment to the community will be missed by many. I join with them in praying for comfort for Judge Freeman's family, friends, and loved ones. Today we honor him as his community grieves his loss and reflects on his life and service.●

AMALGAMATED SUGAR'S CENTURY OF IDAHO SUGAR PRODUCTION

• Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, my colleague Senator JIM RISCH joins me today in recognizing Amalgamated Sugar's 100 years of sugar production in the Magic Valley of Idaho.

With roots that stretch back to 1897, Amalgamated Sugar, a grower-owned cooperative, has been a member of the Magic Valley community for 100 years. Amalgamated Sugar opened its Twin Falls factory on October 22, 1916, followed a year later by the Paul factory on October 28, 1917. Throughout the years, Amalgamated Sugar's growers and employees have navigated the twists and turns of a more than challenging market with sensibility, determination, and innovation. Through its partnership with Amalgamated Research, Inc., ARi, a research and development company owned by Amalgamated Sugar, Amalgamated Sugar has pioneered the use of innovative fractal separation technology and is a leader in processing efficiency. Amalgamated Sugar has also expanded its marketing to reach throughout the United States through its partnership with National Sugar Marketing. The past 100 years of innovation have helped Amalgamated Sugar grow from processing 3,078,000 tons of sugarbeets into 925,000 100-pound bags of sugar in 1917, to the estimated 6,636,000 tons of sugarbeets into 21,058,000 100-pound bags in 2016.

The cooperative's focus on precision production and agronomic advancements has grown it into the second largest beet sugar producer in the U.S., producing 12 percent of the Nation's sugar on 182,000 acres, according to statistics from Amalgamated Sugar. The cooperative's accomplishments result from the teamwork of its approximately 750 growers and more than 1,600 Idaho employees who produce quality sugarbeets, transport them from the fields to the factories, and refine high-quality sugar products, nutritional supplements, and animal-feed products. Amalgamated Sugar is a substantial part of our Nation's economy.

Amalgamated Sugar's contributions include approximately \$800 million in revenues to Idaho's economy, which is evident in the lives of the generations of its growers and employees, in its relationships with local suppliers and vendors, and in the more than \$283 million in Idaho's sugarbeet production estimated by the Idaho State Department of Agriculture.

Congratulations, Amalgamated Sugar growers and employees, on a century of accomplishments. You and your predecessors have much to be proud of for prevailing over more than a 100 years of challenges and contributing significantly to job opportunities and U.S. production. We wish you all the best for continued success.●

TRIBUTE TO CYNTHIA "CINDY" HUBERT

• Mr. DONNELLY. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize and honor the extraordinary service of Cynthia "Cindy" Hubert, a dedicated Hoosier, who has played a critical role in feeding the hungry in Indiana.

On September 24, 2016, Cindy will retire following more than 6 years of service to Gleaners Food Bank of Indiana.

Indiana has benefitted greatly from Cindy's tireless leadership, and she has helped oversee and successfully lead several hunger relief organizations in central Indiana at critical time periods in each organization's history. Her efforts have ensured hundreds of thousands of food-insecure Hoosiers are fed with dignity and hope, giving these families the chance to lead happier, healthier, and more fulfilling lives.

Cindy moved to Indianapolis, IN, after a successful 25-year career with First Union National Bank in Connecticut. After arriving in Indiana, Cindy first led Horizon House, a multi-service center for the homeless. She then went on to lead three of the most critical and impactful organizations in Indiana that feed hungry children, senior citizens, military veterans, and families.

Prior to her transformational leadership at Gleaners, Cindy was president and CEO of Second Helpings, Inc., a leading provider of meals to more than 80 nonprofits in central Indiana. Cindy oversaw one of Second Helpings' most significant periods of change and growth, and it celebrated its 10 million meal distributed this July.

During her time at Second Helpings, Cindy also launched a collaborative program known as the Indy Hunger Network, where key nonprofit, government, donor, and support organizations leverage their unique abilities, combine resources, and talent and impact hunger together. Cindy's idea has grown into a highly effective reality and a key part of the hunger relief network in central Indiana.

In her role as president and CEO of Gleaners, she has supported one-third of Indiana's food-insecure population across 21 counties, working through hundreds of local agencies. During her 6 years at Gleaners, three core programs have tripled in size: Backsacks for Kids, the School Pantry Program, and the Mobile Pantry Program. Cindy helped Gleaners launch important new programs, including summer meals for children in need and a new initiative feeding senior citizens. She also opened an on-site food pantry at the Gleaners distribution center and, over time, worked to increase the food pantry physical's size to six times the original space. Under her leadership, 75 Gleaners employees and tens of thousands of volunteers each year distribute 27.5 million meals; 10,400 backsacks to children for weekends; 135,000 summer meals at 54 sites; more than 328,000 meals to senior citizens; over 2.4 mil-

lion meals to 150,000 hungry Hoosiers at 321 mobile pantry sites; and nearly 1 million meals at 50 school-based pantry sites.

Cindy's integrity and tireless efforts have helped to make Indiana a better place to live, work, and raise a family. We are incredibly grateful for Cindy's leadership and service, and we wish her well in retirement with her husband, Steve, and daughter Stacey.●

REMEMBERING EWING MARION KAUFFMAN

• Mrs. MCCASKILL. Mr. President, I ask the Senate to join me today in honoring the 100th birthday celebration of Ewing Kauffman. Mr. Kauffman was a Kansas City and Missouri icon who lived a life that would make all Americans proud. From founding a pharmaceutical empire, to bringing Major League Baseball back to Kansas City, to establishing a philanthropic foundation that continues to change lives to this day, Mr. Kauffman built a legacy that is deserving of all of our respect.

On June 1, 1950, Mr. Kauffman opened Marion Laboratories. "Mr. K" operated this company from the basement of his home and used his middle name as the company name so that people wouldn't know they were dealing with a small, one-man operation. As he built this humble company into an industry leader, he did so with two guiding philosophies: No. 1, share the rewards with those who produce, and No. 2, treat others the way you wish to be treated. Profit sharing wasn't an industry practice at the time, but it was vital to the company's success and an example of Mr. Kauffman's generosity. By the time the company was sold in 1989, it had provided jobs for 3,400 associates, showed a \$227 million profit, and made 300 Marion Labs associates instant millionaires.

In 1968 Mr. Kauffman said, "Kansas City has been good to me, and I want to show I can return the favor." It was that year that he and Kansas City were awarded a Major League Baseball expansion franchise—the Kansas City Royals were born. However, having a team was not enough for Mr. K; the team needed to win and win a lot. During his time as owner, the Royals won six division titles, two American League pennants, and the 1985 World Series Championship; yet even that was not enough for him to "return the favor" to Kansas City. Mr. Kauffman, worried that a new owner would move the franchise out of Kansas City upon his death, set up an imaginative strategy to ensure that didn't happen. Namely, the profit of the sale by a new owner would have to go to local Kansas City charities, essentially ensuring the franchise would stay in Kansas City. Because of this forward thinking, I am sure Mr. K was smiling down as approximately 800,000 Kansas Citians celebrated at the Royals 2015 World Series Championship Parade.

Even with all that he did during his life, his most lasting legacy will be establishing the foundation that bears his name and continues to effect change to this day: the Kauffman Foundation. Mr. Kauffman regarded his education and ability to be an entrepreneur to be pivotal in his life. For that reason, the Kauffman Foundation focuses its grant making on those two areas, giving people the resources needed to be self-sufficient and make positive change in their community.

Reflecting on his philanthropy, Mr. Kauffman said, "All the money in the world cannot solve problems unless we work together. And, if we work together, there is no problem in the world that can stop us, as we seek to develop people to their highest and best potential." Words that are as true today as they were during his life.

Mr. President, I ask that the Senate join me in honoring the 100th birthday celebration and the life and achievements of one of Kansas City and the State of Missouri's finest citizens, Ewing Marion Kauffman.●

● Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, over the last several years, when Missourians and people across the country open their newspapers or watch the news, they are bombarded with reports that make them feel anxious about the direction of our Nation and the future our children and grandchildren will inherit.

At times like these, when we are filled with anxiety and uncertainty, it is important to remind ourselves of the good done by great Americans in their communities. One man or woman can make a tangible difference to improve the lives of many.

Today I want to recognize one such a great American, as well as Missouri native, Ewing Marion Kauffman, on the 100th anniversary of his birth.

Residents of Kansas City knew and still know Ewing Marion Kauffman well. They are reminded of his lasting legacy every time they see the work of the Kauffman Foundation or when they visit Kauffman Stadium—"The K"—to see the Kansas City Royals.

However, Mr. Kauffman is perhaps best known for his vision that a quality education is the foundation for self-sufficiency, and he used philanthropy to help foster a society of economically independent individuals who are actively engaged in their communities. Indeed, Mr. Kauffman's vision has left an indelible mark on the lives of so many.

By way of background, Ewing Marion Kauffman was born on September 21, 1916, on a farm in Garden City, MO. The son of John and Effie May, the Kauffman family moved to Kansas City when Ewing was just a boy—a place he called home the rest of his life.

Ewing Kauffman was from the generation that weathered the Great Depression. As a boy, he helped his family make ends meet by selling eggs and magazines door to door, even diving into muddy underwater burrows to catch catfish so he could sell them.

During World War II, he served his country in defense of freedom by joining the U.S. Navy. When the war ended, Ewing Kauffman became a salesman for a pharmaceutical company. A born salesman, by the end of his second year, he is said to have earned more in commissions alone than the salary of the president of the company he worked for.

In 1950, Mr. Kauffman struck out and started his own pharmaceutical company: Marion Laboratories.

A few things to note about Marion Laboratories. First, there was no lab. Ewing Kauffman founded this startup in his basement. Second, in a field that requires huge amounts of capital in scientific research, Mr. Kauffman's "research division" consisted of him reading medical journals. As one biographer noted: "He was in a business that was rooted in science and fueled by research, and he had only a smattering of the former and could not afford the latter."

What Mr. Kauffman had in spades, however, was an innate understanding of marketing and an ability to sell a product.

Why call his new startup "Marion Laboratories?"

He used his middle name to suggest that it wasn't a one-man operation.

How good a salesman was he?

In its first year, Marion Labs made \$36,000 in sales. By the time he sold the company in 1989, it made \$1 billion in sales and employed over 3,400 people.

Ewing Kauffman's philosophy in life can be summed up in three basic principles he adhered to:

First, treat others as you want to be treated.

Second, share life's rewards with those who make them possible.

Third, give back to society.

Actions speak louder than words, and it is easy to find examples of Mr. Kauffman's actions that support the principles by which he lived.

A popular boss who treated all his employees with dignity and respect, his employees affectionately took to simply calling him Mr. K. In terms of sharing life's rewards, he offered his employees a profit-sharing plan, stock options, and education benefits. By 1968, 20 of Marion's employees had become millionaires—and reportedly, hundreds had become millionaires by 1989.

But what really makes Ewing Kauffman stand out was his commitment to his third principle: Giving back to society.

There is not enough time to recount all of the work Mr. K did for Kansas City. He was passionate about improving lives and helping to make Kansas City a better place to live and work. I want to take a moment to highlight just a few of his contributions.

First, in 1968, he brought Major League Baseball back to Kansas City. The unique thing about this is that he acquired the team for the benefit of the city. The Kansas City Royals provided the community with a sense of pride,

solidarity, and identity. This is all the more true given the Royals' success—they have won six American League West titles, two pennants, participated in four World Series, and won two World Series championships in 1985 and 2015.

Second, in 1966, he founded the Ewing Marion Kauffman Foundation, a philanthropic organization committed to helping people through education and entrepreneurship and changing the trajectory of their lives.

Always cognizant of the need to create more and better paying jobs, Kauffman saw education and entrepreneurship as two ends of a continuum. As such, he directed the foundation's mission to be one that helps individuals attain economic independence by advancing educational achievement and entrepreneurial success.

Today the Kauffman Foundation is among the largest private foundations in the U.S., with an asset base of approximately \$2 billion, and it sponsors dozens of fundraisers every year to support other nonprofits, funding organizations that accelerate positive change where it is needed most.

Lastly, I want to highlight something really unique. In 1988, Mr. Kauffman went to Kansas City Westport High School—the school he graduated from in 1934—to launch Project Choice.

By the late 1980s, Westport High School was plagued with a 30-percent dropout rate, and the disadvantaged students who attended had to contend with the scourge of serious drug and alcohol abuse. Project Choice was a deal Mr. K struck with 250 eighth graders who were about to attend Westport High School.

Ewing Kauffman offered the students—with the involvement of their parents—a 4-year scholarship to the college, university, or vocational school of their choice, including costs of tuition, books, fees, and room and board. What was the catch you might ask? Each child must graduate from high school in 4 years, have regular attendance, no serious disciplinary problems, and abstain from drugs and alcohol. Additionally, their parents had to agree to meet regularly with their children's teachers, coaches, and counselors and participate in school activities.

When asked why he was taking this initiative, Mr. K responded: "We have racial discrimination now. We have economic discrimination now . . . the answer to social and economic injustice is education."

He later expanded Project Choice to other schools across the Kansas City area.

In 2001, after learning from both successes and challenges with Project Choice, the Kauffman Foundation updated the program to emphasize college access, college preparation, and college graduation as part of its Kauffman Scholars Program.

In short, through its many programs, initiatives, and grants, the Kauffman

Foundation embodies Mr. K's principles. Through its research and programs, the foundation continues to work to increase the percentage of students who achieve successful academic and life outcomes—to create the self-reliant human capital necessary for entrepreneurial success.

Ewing Kauffman saw himself as a common man who did uncommon things. He constantly challenged those around him to reach their full potential and improve the lives of their families and communities. He built a lasting legacy in Kansas City.

Each one of us is capable of doing the same if we live by his principles: to treat others as you would like to be treated, to share life's rewards with those who make them possible, and to give back to society.

That philosophy is perhaps his greatest legacy, and it is a legacy this body should recognize because those principles—combined with a commitment to education and entrepreneurship—are what make good citizens great.●

● Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, today I wish to honor the 100th birthday of Ewing Marion Kauffman, an exceptionally successful Kansas City businessman who also cared deeply about the community he lived in.

Mr. Kauffman was an entrepreneur working out of the basement of his modest Kansas City home when he founded Marion Laboratories in June of 1950. By 1965, he had grown his small pharmaceutical business into a publicly traded company and introduced an innovative profit-sharing model so that all of his associates would reap the financial benefits of his company's accomplishments. His lifelong focus on enabling others to succeed has benefited generations of Kansans and all in the Kansas City community.

By 1989, Marion Laboratories merged with Merrell Dow to form Marion Merrell Dow, which provided jobs for 3,400 associates. Marion Merrell Dow became the fifth largest drug company in the United States in terms of sales. Leading Mr. Kauffman to this success were two guiding philosophic principles: No. 1, share the rewards with those who produce and No. 2, treat others as you wish to be treated. His principles continue to serve as a model of professional culture to new businesses across a wide variety of industries, and oftentimes, these new businesses are started by former associates of Mr. Kauffman's company and its affiliates.

Following Mr. Kauffman's success in business, he used his considerable resources to do good, establishing the Ewing Marion Kauffman Foundation in 1966. The foundation sought to address systemic issues within underserved communities around Kansas City—notably focused on improving the quality of education in the area and promoting and fostering entrepreneurship as a means of empowerment and opportunity for individuals.

Mr. Kauffman's legacy addressing fundamental challenges in the local

community through a research-based approach continues today through the innovative work of the Ewing Marion Kauffman Foundation. The foundation continues to focus on advancing education and entrepreneurship opportunities through strategic partnerships and inclusive dialogue among all pertinent private and public parties. In June, the foundation announced its 100 Acts of Generosity campaign to encourage the public to participate in community service efforts to honor Mr. Kauffman's legacy, while awarding a \$1 million grant to the Kansas City Royals' Urban Youth Academy to serve 800 to 1,000 young people with free baseball and softball clinics and instruction.

Mr. Kauffman also brought Major League Baseball back to his hometown, founding the Kansas City Royals in 1968. Under Kauffman's leadership, the organization sold more than 2 million tickets per season during 11 different seasons and won six division titles, two American League pennants, and the 1985 World Series Championship. Mr. Kauffman also developed innovative measures to ensure the Royals would remain in Kansas City long after his death in 1993.

In reflection of Mr. Kauffman's philanthropic mission, I conclude my remarks with a statement by Mr. Kauffman himself: "All of the money in the world cannot solve problems unless we work together. And, if we work together, there is no problem in the world that can stop us, as we seek to develop people to their highest and best potential."●

REMEMBERING DR. MOLLY MACAULEY

● Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I would like to take a moment to note the sad and untimely passing of a wonderful pillar of our Baltimore community, Dr. Molly Macauley. This is a very sad time not only for the Roland Park neighborhood of Baltimore where Dr. Macauley lived, but also for the Johns Hopkins community and Resources of the Future, where Dr. Macauley gave so much of her time and energy.

Molly Macauley was widely admired by her family, friends, and colleagues for her determination to impact the world. Originally from northern Virginia, she graduated from William and Mary in 1979 and came to Baltimore to study at Johns Hopkins University. She received her master's in 1981 and her doctoral degree in economics in 1983. Dr. Macauley was a visiting professor at Johns Hopkins for 20 years. She also joined the think tank "Resources for the Future," eventually becoming vice president for research. Dr. Macauley was considered an expert in environmental economics, leading the way into the future in space research and renewable energy. She also served on committees involved in science, space, and medicine, finding common ground and moving all of us forward.

We could use more role models like her everywhere today.

Dr. Macauley spent her time dedicated to becoming a better leader and raising those around her up as well. She put forth so much effort to make sure that the work she was doing had the greatest possible influence. She tried to bring good to this world through her award-winning journal articles, her time spent testifying in front of Congress, and educating the next generation of changemakers. Dr. Macauley will be remembered in Baltimore especially for the love she had for our city. She chose to commute to D.C. each day because she couldn't bear to leave Baltimore for too long. She never let anyone forget their ties to Baltimore either. Even if they moved away, she sent Baltimore's world-famous Berger cookies and treats to remind them of home.

Her passing has been a shock to our community, to have such an upstanding and valued member of it so brutally attacked. I know the community will be there for each other as we come to terms with her tragic loss. I ask that my colleagues join me in expressing sympathy to Dr. Macauley's family and friends as they mourn the loss of this remarkable woman and remember the impact she had on our Nation.●

REMEMBERING DR. RAYMOND C. BUSHLAND

● Mr. ROUNDS. Mr. President, today I wish to commemorate the life and work of Dr. Raymond C. Bushland, a native of South Dakota.

Dr. Bushland, along with his colleague Edward F. Knipling of Texas, made tremendous scientific advancements in eradicating and suppressing the threat posed by pests to the livestock and crops that contribute to the world's food supply. Dr. Bushland will be posthumously honored with the Golden Goose Award for his and Dr. Knipling's research on the screwworm fly. The Golden Goose Award recognizes scientists who have made significant contributions to society through unique federally funded projects.

Bushland was raised in Clearlake, SD, and graduated from South Dakota State University in 1932 with degrees in entomology and zoology. After earning his masters in 1934, he began working at a laboratory for the U.S. Department of Agriculture in Dallas, TX, where he met Dr. Knipling. The two shared a fascination with the screwworm fly, a rampant and aggressive pest that primarily targeted cattle. The screwworm fly could decimate herds in a matter of weeks and was nearly impossible to prevent.

Through their research, Bushland and Knipling hypothesized that scientists could combat the pest by controlling its population, an approach that was met with great skepticism. Regardless, Bushland successfully devised the "sterile insect technique," a revolutionary method in controlling

pest populations. The hypothesis was soon confirmed.

By preventing regular reproduction, they began seeing results immediately, and in 1982, the screwworm fly was declared completely eradicated in the U.S. Since this breakthrough, the U.S. Department of Agriculture has partnered with countries throughout the Western Hemisphere to continue eradicating screwworm flies and preventing reinfestation.

The technique pioneered by Bushland and Knipling saved the cattle industry an estimated \$20 billion since its implementation and has been applied to various insect species since. Today, scientists are using the same technique to combat the spread of the Zika virus. This feat is lauded as one of the most important developments in pest control, as well as one of the first peaceful uses of nuclear radiation.

Bushland's work represents a pinnacle of scientific achievement that helped pave a new era of food security and public health. His curiosity, perseverance, and ingenuity continue to be a source of inspiration for students in South Dakota and across the country. For his commitment to science, education, and society, we thank him.●

RECOGNIZING MORRIS & DICKSON CO. LLC

● Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, oftentimes the truest test of a small business's strength is its longevity. In Louisiana, our small businesses have worked through countless challenges and survived for generations to improve the lives of their neighbors and make substantial contributions to the economy. In honor of their 175th anniversary, I would like to present Morris & Dickson Co. LLC of Shreveport, LA, with the Senate Small Business Legacy Award for the important achievements of this Louisiana-based small business success story.

In 1841, John Worthington Morris opened J. W. Morris & Co., an independent pharmacy in downtown Shreveport, LA. Working out of a single riverfront warehouse, J.W. first received goods by steamboat from New Orleans and, with the help of his brother, Thomas Henry, ran his namesake small business until his death 12 years later. A second generation of the Morris family continued J.W.'s legacy until Claudius Dickson bought the business in 1899, renaming it to be Morris & Dickson Co. Claudius worked with members of the Morris family to grow their wholesale pharmaceutical business. As technology improved, with new railway lines and gasoline-powered trucks, Morris & Dickson Co. embraced the revolutionary improvements to distribute their pharmaceuticals in Louisiana and the surrounding States.

In order to survive the Civil War, the Great Depression, as well as the day-to-day struggles of running a successful business, the leaders of Morris & Dickson Co. took advantage of each

technological improvement to ensure the company would stay afloat.

It wasn't until the 1980s that Morris & Dickson Co. grew exponentially and became a nationally recognized competitor. At the time, Morris & Dickson Co. was working out of the same building it had first moved into in 1905. Nearly eight decades later, they were still transporting goods in a manual freight elevator and used a dumbwaiter or rope bucket to send orders upstairs. Claudius's son Markham Allen Dickson recognized that major changes had to be made and, much like his predecessors, had an immense respect for technology's growing influence. M. Allen's foresight and ingenuity allowed the family-owned business to grow to become the region's leading wholesale drug distributor. He moved the company out of downtown Shreveport and utilized the early use of computers. Under his leadership, Morris & Dickson Co. exploded on the national wholesale pharmaceutical scene. By 2013, Morris & Dickson Co. was the fourth largest pharmaceutical distributor in the Nation.

Still driven by the 175-year-old ambition to elevate the standard of patient care for their neighbors and community, today Morris & Dickson Co. is run by M. Allen's son, Paul Dickson. Morris & Dickson Co. has a well-earned reputation for persevering through many hardships by embracing innovation in order to harness the power of an ever-changing economy and increasingly technology-driven world.

Today, Morris & Dickson Co. provides operational and logistic innovation support for independent pharmacies. This includes everything from ontime delivery of pharmaceutical inventory to inventory management software. With Morris & Dickson Co.'s help, independent pharmacies in 14 States can focus on supporting and improving the health of their local communities, while also remaining financially solvent.

This Shreveport-based family-run business is a great example of the American Dream in action, and companies like Morris & Dickson certainly serve as role models for the next generation of entrepreneurs. I congratulate the hard-working folks at Morris & Dickson Co. LLC on 175 years in business and for the well-deserved honor of the Senate Small Business Legacy Award.●

TRIBUTE TO MISSISSIPPI'S OLYMPIANS AND PARALYMPIANS

● Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, today I wish to congratulate the Mississippians who competed in the Olympics and Paralympics in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. They have indeed made us proud.

One of our Olympic all-stars—Tori Bowie—came home with a complete set of medals, earning bronze, silver, and gold in track-and-field events. Tori is from Sandhill, a community in Rankin County, and attended the University of

Southern Mississippi. She earned her bronze medal in the 200-meter, her silver in the 100-meter, and her gold in the 4x100-meter relay.

Another track-and-field star, Sam Kendricks, also made news headlines for both his bronze medal in pole vault and a powerful moment of patriotism. During the qualifying round, the second lieutenant in the Army Reserve stopped sprinting during his pole vault attempt to stand at attention when he heard "the Star-Spangled Banner." Sam is from Oxford and attended the University of Mississippi.

Gulfport native Brittny Reese made history at the 2012 London games, where she became the first American woman to win a gold medal in long jump in more than 20 years. She did not leave Rio empty-handed. The six-time world champion and Ole Miss alumna earned a silver medal in her third Olympics.

Rounding out Mississippi's roster was Ricky Robertson of Hernando, a former track-and-field star at the University of Mississippi who competed in high jump at his first Olympics.

For 10 other athletes, the road to Rio went through Mississippi. These talented individuals have made our State home as alumni, students, or coaches at our universities. Congratulations are in order for Gwen Berry, Mateo Edward, Marta Freitas, Antwon Hicks, Anaso Jobodwana, Mariam Kromah, Brandon McBride, Raven Saunders, Khadijah Suleman, and Michael Tinsley.

Following the Olympics, Mississippians again turned to Rio to cheer for our local all-stars in the 2016 Paralympic Games.

Charlie Swearingen from Gulfport competed on the sitting volleyball team, which finished eighth. He joined two-time Paralympians Joey Brinson from Florence and Shaquille Vance from Houston, who had earned a silver medal in 2012. Joey finished ninth in his category of wheelchair fencing, and Shaquille finished fourth in the men's T42 200-meter run.

The Olympics and Paralympics are an inspiring showcase of international goodwill and sportsmanship. These Mississippians have represented us well on the world stage, and I have no doubt they will continue to succeed in their future endeavors.●

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 12:02 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. 670. An act to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to extend the Medicaid rules regarding supplemental needs trusts for Medicaid beneficiaries to trusts established by those beneficiaries, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3937. An act to designate the building utilized as a United States courthouse located at 150 Reade Circle in Greenville,

North Carolina, as the “Randy D. Doub United States Courthouse”.

H.R. 4887. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 23323 Shelby Road in Shelby, Indiana, as the “Richard Allen Cable Post Office”.

H.R. 5150. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3031 Veterans Road West in Staten Island, New York, as the “Leonard Montalto Post Office Building”.

H.R. 5309. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 401 McElroy Drive in Oxford, Mississippi, as the “Army First Lieutenant Donald C. Carwile Post Office Building”.

H.R. 5356. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 14231 TX-150 in Coldspring, Texas, as the “E. Marie Youngblood Post Office”.

H.R. 5591. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 810 N US Highway 83 in Zapata, Texas, as the “Zapata Veterans Post Office”.

H.R. 5612. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2886 Sandy Plains Road in Marietta, Georgia, as the “Marine Lance Corporal Squire ‘Skip’ Wells Post Office Building”.

H.R. 5676. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 6300 N. Northwest Highway in Chicago, Illinois, as the “Officer Joseph P. Cali Post Office Building”.

H.R. 5687. An act to eliminate or modify certain mandates of the Government Accountability Office.

H.R. 5690. An act to ensure the Government Accountability Office has adequate access to information.

H.R. 5785. An act to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for an annuity supplement for certain air traffic controllers.

H.R. 5889. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1 Chalan Kanoa VLG in Saipan, Northern Mariana Islands, as the “Segundo T. Sablan and CNMI Fallen Military Heroes Post Office Building”.

H.R. 5944. An act to amend title 49, United States Code, with respect to certain grant assurances, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5957. An act to include disabled veteran leave in the personnel management system of the Federal Aviation Administration.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

At 12:56 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bills:

H.R. 5936. An act to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to enter into certain leases at the Department of Veterans Affairs West Los Angeles Campus in Los Angeles, California, to make certain improvements to the enhanced-use lease authority of the Department, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5985. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend certain expiring provisions of law administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

The enrolled bills were subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 670. An act to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to extend the Medicaid rules regarding supplemental needs trusts for Medicaid beneficiaries to trusts estab-

lished by those beneficiaries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

H.R. 3937. An act to designate the building utilized as a United States courthouse located at 150 Reade Circle in Greenville, North Carolina, as the “Randy D. Doub United States Courthouse”; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

H.R. 4887. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 23323 Shelby Road in Shelby, Indiana, as the “Richard Allen Cable Post Office”; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 5150. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3031 Veterans Road West in Staten Island, New York, as the “Leonard Montalto Post Office Building”; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 5309. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 401 McElroy Drive in Oxford, Mississippi, as the “Army First Lieutenant Donald C. Carwile Post Office Building”; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 5356. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 14231 TX-150 in Coldspring, Texas, as the “E. Marie Youngblood Post Office”; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 5591. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 810 N US Highway 83 in Zapata, Texas, as the “Zapata Veterans Post Office”; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 5612. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2886 Sandy Plains Road in Marietta, Georgia, as the “Marine Lance Corporal Squire ‘Skip’ Wells Post Office Building”; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 5676. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 6300 N. Northwest Highway in Chicago, Illinois, as the “Officer Joseph P. Cali Post Office Building”; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 5889. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1 Chalan Kanoa VLG in Saipan, Northern Mariana Islands, as the “Segundo T. Sablan and CNMI Fallen Military Heroes Post Office Building”; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 5944. An act to amend title 49, United States Code, with respect to certain grant assurances, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5957. An act to include disabled veteran leave in the personnel management system of the Federal Aviation Administration.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSON, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, without amendment:

S. 2849. A bill to ensure the Government Accountability Office has adequate access to information (Rept. No. 114-356).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. ALEXANDER for the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

*Thomas G. Kotarac, of Illinois, to be a Member of the Railroad Retirement Board for a term expiring August 28, 2017.

*Constance Smith Barker, of Alabama, to be a Member of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission for a term expiring July 1, 2021.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee’s commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

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. HATCH:

S. 3366. A bill to streamline the R-1 religious worker visa petition process; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WARNER (for himself, Mr. BENNET, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BURR, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. DAINES, Mr. GARDNER, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. KAINE, Mr. KING, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PETERS, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. TESTER, Mr. TILLIS, and Ms. WARREN):

S. 3367. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out certain major medical facility leases of the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs.

By Mr. COONS (for himself and Mr. ISAKSON):

S. 3368. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to improve college access and college completion for all students; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MCCAIN (for himself, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. COTTON, Mr. BURR, Mr. GRAHAM, and Mr. SESSIONS):

S. 3369. A bill to amend section 2709 of title 18, United States Code, to clarify that the Government may obtain a specified set of electronic communication transactional records under that section, and to make permanent the authority for individual terrorists to be treated as agents of foreign powers under the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITEHOUSE:

S. 3370. A bill to restrict confidentiality agreements that prohibit the disclosure of information relating to hazards to public safety or health, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. BENNET, Mr. NELSON, and Mr. BROWN):

S. 3371. A bill to amend titles II, XVIII, and XIX of the Social Security Act to improve the affordability and enrollment procedures of the Medicare program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CASSIDY:

S. 3372. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a partial exclusion from the excise tax imposed on heavy trucks sold at retail for alternative fuel trucks; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WARNER (for himself and Mr. MORAN):

S. 3373. A bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to ensure that the reciprocal deposits of an insured depository institution are not considered to be funds obtained by or through a deposit broker, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. NELSON:

S. 3374. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a reduced excise tax rate for portable, electronically aerated bait containers; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. BALDWIN (for herself and Mr. PETERS):

S. 3375. A bill to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1985 to enhance the Small Business Investment Company Program and provide for a small business early-stage investment program; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Mr. COTTON (for himself, Mr. LEE, and Mr. GRAHAM):

S. 3376. A bill to ensure the integrity of laws enacted to prevent the use of financial instruments for funding or operating online casinos are not undermined by legal opinions not carrying the force of law issued by Federal Government lawyers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. BOXER (for herself and Mrs. SHAHEEN):

S. 3377. A bill to increase the participation of women in foreign security forces, specifically the military and police, with United States foreign assistance; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. BURR (for himself and Mr. TILLIS):

S. 3378. A bill to amend the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 to designate certain parts of United States Route 264 and the Eastern North Carolina Gateway Corridor as future parts of the Interstate System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. THUNE (for himself, Mr. NELSON, Mrs. FISCHER, and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 3379. A bill to improve surface transportation and maritime security; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 388

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 388, a bill to amend the Animal Welfare Act to require humane treatment of animals by Federal Government facilities.

S. 540

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 540, a bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to require the Secretary of Agriculture to make loan guarantees and grants to finance certain improvements to school lunch facilities, to train school food service personnel, and for other purposes.

S. 569

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 569, a bill to reauthorize the farm to school program, and for other purposes.

S. 574

At the request of Mr. SCOTT, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 574, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow employers a credit against income tax for employees who participate in qualified apprenticeship programs.

S. 689

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma

(Mr. LANKFORD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 689, a bill to provide protections for certain sports medicine professionals who provide certain medical services in a secondary State.

S. 1539

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1539, a bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to establish a permanent, nationwide summer electronic benefits transfer for children program.

S. 1945

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1945, a bill to make available needed psychiatric, psychological, and supportive services for individuals with mental illness and families in mental health crisis, and for other purposes.

S. 2067

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2067, a bill to establish EUREKA Prize Competitions to accelerate discovery and development of disease-modifying, preventive, or curative treatments for Alzheimer's disease and related dementia, to encourage efforts to enhance detection and diagnosis of such diseases, or to enhance the quality and efficiency of care of individuals with such diseases.

S. 2216

At the request of Mrs. MCCASKILL, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2216, a bill to provide immunity from suit for certain individuals who disclose potential examples of financial exploitation of senior citizens, and for other purposes.

S. 2341

At the request of Mr. BENNET, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2341, a bill to designate a portion of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge as wilderness.

S. 2420

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2420, a bill to amend the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 to modify the exception to the work requirement.

S. 2595

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2595, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the railroad track maintenance credit.

S. 2832

At the request of Mr. ISAKSON, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. CORKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2832, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure fairness in Medicare hospital payments by

establishing a floor for the area wage index applied with respect to certain hospitals.

S. 2873

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2873, a bill to require studies and reports examining the use of, and opportunities to use, technology-enabled collaborative learning and capacity building models to improve programs of the Department of Health and Human Services, and for other purposes.

S. 2912

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) was added as a cosponsor 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. 2927

At the request of Mr. LANKFORD, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2927, a bill to prevent governmental discrimination against providers of health services who decline involvement in abortion, and for other purposes.

S. 2932

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2932, a bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act with respect to the provision of emergency medical services.

S. 2941

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2941, a bill to require a study on women and lung cancer, and for other purposes.

S. 2953

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2953, a bill to promote patient-centered care and accountability at the Indian Health Service, and for other purposes.

S. 3006

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3006, a bill to provide for the exchange of certain National Forest System land and non-Federal land in the State of Alaska, and for other purposes.

S. 3023

At the request of Mrs. MCCASKILL, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3023, a bill to provide for the reconsideration of claims for disability compensation for veterans who were the subjects of experiments by the Department of Defense during World War II that were conducted to assess the effects of mustard gas or lewisite on people, and for other purposes.

S. 3065

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3065, a bill to amend parts B and E of title IV of the Social Security Act to invest in funding prevention and family services to help keep children safe and supported at home, to ensure that children in foster care are placed in the least restrictive, most family-like, and appropriate settings, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3065, *supra*.

S. 3073

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3073, a bill to establish a commission to ensure a suitable observance of the centennial of the passage and ratification of the Nineteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution providing for women's suffrage, and for other purposes.

S. 3101

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3101, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to limit the liability of health care professionals who volunteer to provide health care services in response to a disaster.

S. 3198

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the names of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS), the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 3198, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the provision of adult day health care services for veterans.

S. 3244

At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3244, a bill to amend title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act to clarify the treatment of pediatric dental coverage in the individual and group markets outside of Exchanges established under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, and for other purposes.

S. 3253

At the request of Mrs. FISCHER, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. SASSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3253, a bill to require the Occupational Safety and Health Administration to provide notice and comment rulemaking for the revised enforcement policy relating to the exemption of retail facilities from coverage of the process safety management of highly hazardous chemicals standard under section 1910.119(a)(2)(i) of title 29, Code of Federal Regulations, and for other purposes.

S. 3270

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms.

COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3270, a bill to prevent elder abuse and exploitation and improve the justice system's response to victims in elder abuse and exploitation cases.

S. 3285

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3285, a bill to prohibit the President from using funds appropriated under section 1304 of title 31, United States Code, to make payments to Iran, to impose sanctions with respect to Iranian persons that hold or detain United States citizens, and for other purposes.

S. 3296

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3296, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an exemption to the individual mandate to maintain health coverage for individuals residing in counties with fewer than 2 health insurance issuers offering plans on an Exchange.

S. 3297

At the request of Mr. COTTON, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3297, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an exemption to the individual mandate to maintain health coverage for certain individuals whose premium has increased by more than 10 percent, and for other purposes.

S. 3304

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3304, a bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to improve the Veterans Crisis Line.

S. 3308

At the request of Mrs. CAPITO, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3308, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to prohibit prescription drug plan sponsors and MA-PD organizations under the Medicare program from retroactively reducing payment on clean claims submitted by pharmacies.

S. 3328

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3328, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to reform the rights and processes relating to appeals of decisions regarding claims for benefits under the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 3355

At the request of Mr. COTTON, the names of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) and the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. SASSE) were added as cosponsors of S. 3355, a bill to prohibit funding for the Preparatory Commission for the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Trea-

ty Organization in the event the United Nations Security Council adopts a resolution that obligates the United States or affirms a purported obligation of the United States to refrain from actions that would run counter to the object and purpose of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty.

S. RES. 527

At the request of Mr. UDALL, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 527, a resolution recognizing the 75th anniversary of the opening of the National Gallery of Art.

S. RES. 535

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 535, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding the trafficking of illicit fentanyl into the United States from Mexico and China.

S. RES. 570

At the request of Mr. MURPHY, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 570, a resolution recognizing the importance of substance abuse disorder treatment and recovery in the United States.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 21, 2016, at 10 a.m., in room SR-328A of the Russell Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled "The U.S. Department of Agriculture and the Current State of Farm Economy."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. CORNYN. 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 September 21, 2016, at 10 a.m., in room SR-253 of the Russell Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 21, 2016, at 10 a.m., in room SD-215 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Indian Affairs be authorized

to meet during the session of the Senate on September 21, 2016, in room SD-628 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, at 2 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 21, 2016, at 1 p.m., in room SH-219 of the Hart Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON FISHERIES, WATER, AND WILDLIFE

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Fisheries, Water, and Wildlife of the Committee on Environment and Public Works be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 21, 2016, at 2:30 p.m., in room SD-406 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled, "Reviewing the Proposed Revisions to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Mitigation Policy."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL SECURITY AND INTERNATIONAL TRADE AND FINANCE

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs Subcommittee on National Security and International Trade and Finance be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 21, 2016, at 10:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled, "Terror Financing Risks of America's \$1.7 Billion Cash Payments to Iran."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. DONNELLY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Sarah Thomson, a member of my staff, be granted floor privileges for the day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY,
SEPTEMBER 22, 2016

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m., Thursday, September 22; 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 be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each until 11 a.m.; that following morning business, the Senate resume consideration of the motion to proceed to H.R. 5325, postcloture; further, that notwithstanding the provisions of rule XXII, all postcloture time on the motion to proceed to H.R. 5325 expire at 11 a.m. tomorrow; finally, that if the motion to proceed is agreed to, Senator MCCONNELL be recognized to offer a substitute amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M.
TOMORROW

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:31 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, September 22, 2016, at 9:30 a.m.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION VETERAN TRANSITION IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2016

SPEECH OF

HON. FRANK A. LoBIONDO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 20, 2016

Mr. LoBIONDO. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5957, the Federal Aviation Administration Veteran Transition Improvement Act, allows an important federal benefit to be extended to newly hired veterans at the FAA. This commonsense piece of legislation corrects an oversight in the Wounded Warriors Federal Leave Act that was passed last year. This act inadvertently excluded FAA employees from coverage.

One out of three veterans who served after September 11th report having a service-connected disability and more than two-thirds of those disabilities are rated 30 percent or higher. Mr. Speaker, just in my district, there are more than 40,000 veterans, of whom many have the skill-sets and aviation background needed to succeed in highly technical FAA positions.

This bill can help ensure that a veteran's service will not become an obstacle for future employment. I appreciate the leadership and partnership of Mr. LARSEN on this simple, important fix to an employment barrier for veterans in our nation.

I urge my colleagues to support the passage of H.R. 5957.

TRIBUTE TO ANNE MARIE CHOTVACS

HON. HAROLD ROGERS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 2016

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Anne Marie Chotvacs, the clerk of the State, Foreign Operations Appropriations Subcommittee, who will be leaving the Committee staff after more than twelve years of service.

Anne Marie joined the Appropriations Committee staff in 2004 and has worked on various subcommittees and for various chairmen since that time, ultimately becoming the clerk of the State, Foreign Operations Subcommittee in 2009.

As the Chairman of the Appropriations Committee, I have had the honor and pleasure of working closely with Anne Marie. She provides me with advice and information for many meetings, including those with foreign dignitaries here in the U.S. and overseas, as well as guides the Subcommittee legislation through the complicated and often difficult foreign policy and foreign assistance issues that arise each year.

Anne Marie is a dedicated professional. She efficiently manages her staff, and she sets an

example as a leader who has always been willing to put the Committee first. She has sacrificed countless hours, weeks, and years to further the work of the Committee and advance the interests of the United States in a responsible and fiscally sustainable manner.

I have said before, and I will say again, the Appropriations Committee has the best staff on Capitol Hill. Anne Marie is the epitome of that statement. Congress, and I, will miss Anne Marie's contributions and leadership; but we thank her for her dedication and professionalism and wish her well in her future endeavors.

RECOGNIZING ARMENIA'S 25TH INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. SCOTT GARRETT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 2016

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Congressional Armenian Caucus, I rise today to recognize Armenia's twenty-fifth Independence Day on September 21st.

Both the United States and Armenia share the belief that remembering our countries' heritages is critical to paving the path to tomorrow. In the first genocide of the 20th century, nearly 1.5 million Armenians perished at the hands of the Ottoman Empire. And, for much of the Twentieth Century, Armenia was under the brutal rule of the Soviet Union. Although history has presented the Armenian people with many challenges, they have always found a way to triumph in the face of daunting adversity.

The United States has consistently stood with Armenia over the last twenty-five years as the Armenian people have shown how a former Republic of the Soviet Union could transition into a thriving democratic nation-state. As we have seen around the world, new democracies will have their struggles. However, I am confident that the resiliency and strength of the Armenian people will allow them to overcome any obstacles challenging their country's bright future.

I would again like to congratulate the people of Armenia on their twenty-fifth Independence Day. This anniversary is a time to remember the sacrifices of the past and to look ahead to a future.

COMMEMORATING THE PASSING OF AND RECENT STREET NAMING IN HONOR OF ERNESTINE ANDERSON

HON. JIM McDERMOTT

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 2016

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Ms. Ernestine Anderson, who

was recently commemorated in Seattle with a street renamed in her honor. Ms. Anderson passed away on March 10, 2016. She was an internationally renowned and a beloved Seattle jazz vocalist. Ms. Anderson's career spanned over six decades and earned her four Grammy nominations. In fitting commemoration, Ernestine Anderson Way now spans the heart of Seattle's Central District, where her career started.

Ernestine Anderson was born in Houston, Texas on November 11, 1928 and began singing when she was 3 years old. Her family moved to Seattle in 1944 and she began singing in clubs on Jackson Street in the Central District as a teenager. During her career, Ernestine Anderson performed at the Kennedy Center and Carnegie Hall and in 1958 she performed at the first Monterey Jazz Festival.

After many years touring and recording music in Los Angeles, New York and London, Ms. Anderson returned to Seattle and briefly retired from music, working as a hotel maid and at a telephone answering service. Ms. Anderson is known for her song "Never Make Your Move Too Soon," which was recorded by B.B. King, and appeared on her Grammy nominated album in 1981.

In 2002, Ms. Anderson was awarded the Golden Umbrella by the popular Seattle music and arts festival known as Bumbershoot. In 2012, the Low Income Housing Institute named one of their projects Ernestine Anderson Place. These acknowledgements are a testament to the impact that Ms. Ernestine has had on Seattle.

Ernestine Anderson has left an indelible mark on our community and her legacy will live on through her music. A memorial service for Ernestine Anderson took place on April 9, 2016 in Seattle, Washington at the historical Paramount Theater. She will be greatly missed.

TRIBUTE IN HONOR OF THE LIFE OF JOHN MICHAEL ANSTETT

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 2016

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the words of Zachary Anstett, written in memory of his beloved father, John Michael Anstett. Zachary's words are as follows:

Whenever I think of my dad, the very first thing that always comes to mind is a familiar scene, not a particular one: perhaps our family's workhorse car needs to be fixed by tomorrow morning otherwise countless important lessons, orthodontics appointments, not to mention after school activities of soccer, piano lessons, and Martial Arts training will be missed. Which is why we are both crouched under the jacked up car (don't worry, this is likely where he teaches me about the safety jack stands provide us working under the car) everything looking like a black and white film in the harsh caged high wattage light-bulb's glow. I do believe I learned about the difference between

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

drum brakes and disc brakes and how technically, disc brakes are better but our car has drum brakes.

This scene is so familiar to me because it was in those times I could literally see him leave my time frame and go back to the early seventies. He's built himself and rebuilt himself an even better Chevy Camaro (obviously, red) and this car is legendary for spitting fire and raking in the speeding tickets all over north Texas. Not to mention the famous ticket you were most proud of: the one you received for disturbing the peace because your car's idle was too loud. You see he loved these things because he carefully built these things lovingly with his own hands—just how he built our family.

His first attempt at building a son obviously more flawed, contained more mistakes not for lack of love or care. Just maybe he spent a little too long trying to build as much in from the get-go. He named this project Chris and it remains one of the only things he made that was so full of love that nobody could every question this one most-important goal of the project. Not just to build a wondrous and wonderful human being: my brother. But to ensure this child would know he was loved not by saying it but by doing it. This child never went hungry, never had to be homeless, and got one of the best educations possible in that time at that space. This child indeed would become just as precisely crafted by hand as the Camaro.

Son number 2 was by name and by necessity different. He must have decided to hold back more on the built in features and leave some room for exploration, for curiosity, for discovery of the truth of things and how they behave in the world. A son who would rather go on a nature walk or be taken to a local park than sit in his bedroom reading voraciously as did number 1. Chris, in this way, added quite a bit to his own education and discovery. The end goal was the same: that they would learn and grow and know that one thing that could never be questioned, doubted, or denied: These two projects, these two things, made lovingly with his own hands would always be to him the pinnacle of his achievements, would always be what he was most proud of or loved the most.

In short: I feel the truth of the love he had for me, my brother, and my family and it is indestructible, absolute, and unending. I could never capture how I felt about my father and how he viewed the world and me if I simply and directly laid it all out. The sheer weight of importance of just one fact: that he made many sacrifices to his own life that ours might be better is indescribably massive.

Finally, if you knew John, I mean REALLY knew him, though he might not ever say it to you, you just knew he loved you dearly. His love was never obvious, conventional, or easy to understand. That was my dad: a man with a huge capacity to love and did so, clearly communicating it is the only flaw. But how insignificant is this flaw compared to the size of his heart? I love you Dad. I miss you so much already. I can't wait for you to hear me read it. Love, Zach

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in extending our most sincere condolences to the family of John Michael Anstett.

RECOGNIZING DOUBLE TEN DAY

HON. SCOTT DesJARLAIS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 2016

Mr. DesJARLAIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the upcoming Double Ten

Day, the Republic of China's, also known as Taiwan, national day, which falls on October 10th. As the House will not be in session that day, I would like to take this opportunity to offer my early best wishes to the people of Taiwan.

Over the past 50 years, Taiwan has undergone dramatic political, social, and economic changes and is now the only democracy in the Chinese speaking world. This year, the people of Taiwan witnessed the third peaceful transition of power with the election of the first woman to the Presidency, Dr. Tsai Ing-wen.

There are important common values and principles that link the United States and Taiwan, including respect for human rights, freedom, and democracy and I commend President Tsai Ing-wen for reiterating Taiwan's commitment to these values.

Taiwan has been and will continue to be a reliable and vital trading partner in East Asia. According to the U.S. Department of Commerce, U.S. trade in goods with Taiwan reached U.S. \$66 billion last year, making Taiwan our 9th largest trading partner in 2015.

Taiwan is a prosperous society, a major contributor to the global economy, and plays an important role in the peace and security of the Asia-Pacific region. As such, it is troubling to know that Taiwan continues to be barred from a number of international organizations, many of which, like the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO), serve to promote safety and strengthen diplomacy among the global community. For the sake of passenger safety and international security, the country must be brought into the ICAO fold. Taiwan should be invited to attend the ICAO Assembly on a regular basis, enabling it to keep up-to-date with important matters and assist the Assembly in ensuring the safe, secure, and sustainable development of international civil aviation.

In closing, I applaud the nation of Taiwan for its strong commitment to democratic values and I wish them all the best at their celebrations in Taiwan and at the Twin Oaks Estate.

HONORING DEAN VICTOR WHITE

HON. TODD ROKITA

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 2016

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember a dear friend, a business visionary, a World War II veteran, and a dedicated community leader from the Hoosier State.

Mr. Dean V. White passed away on Wednesday, September 14, 2016. Dean attended the University of Nebraska and was a 1945 graduate of the Merchant Marine Academy in King's Point, New York. Dean served in the South Pacific during World War II as First Mate.

Dean joined his father's billboard company, White Advertising, in 1946. During his years at the helm of that company, he grew its portfolio with investments in real estate and hotel management and earned a spot on the Forbes 400 list. Dean, and his wife Barbara, created the Dean and Barbara White Family Foundation where they provided scholarships for local students, helped expand the Crown Point YMCA, and engaged in remodeling the Lake County Courthouse through the Crown Point Community Foundation.

Dean was always interested in politics, but not from a partisan perspective or interest. You see, Mr. Speaker, like many we in this chamber encounter, Dean White cared deeply about his community, our beloved Indiana, and this country. He knew he was blessed by this great nation that allowed him to freely pursue his dreams and grow his family.

Dean understood well the meaning of American Exceptionalism and knew we are the 'last best hope on earth'. So Dean, unlike many others with his kind of blessings, made sure to be involved in his government. He was a leader in this regard and in so many other ways.

I am grateful for the brief time we had together and I always learned from him during our conversations. I pray for Dean's family, his associates at White Advertising, and all who had the honor of knowing this great man.

RECOGNIZING THE DEDICATED SERVICE OF COLONEL ROBERT M. KIRILA, US ARMY

HON. JEFF MILLER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 2016

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Colonel Robert M. Kirila, US Army, upon the occasion of his retirement. Colonel Kirila dedicated more than 25 years in the United States Army, with 19 years in Special Forces, most recently as Deputy Commander of the 7th Special Forces Group (Airborne), in Eglin Air Force Base, Florida. It is my privilege to pay tribute to his honorable service to Northwest Florida and our great Nation.

A native of Norfolk, Virginia, Colonel Kirila graduated Simsbury High School, in Simsbury, Connecticut in 1987 and immediately returned home to attend the University of Richmond. After graduating with a degree in Spanish, he was commissioned in the United States Army and served as a Platoon Leader in the 7th Infantry Division.

In 1997, Colonel Kirila graduated from the Special Forces Qualification Course, earning his Green Beret, and was assigned to 2nd Battalion, 1st Special Forces Group (Airborne). He served as Detachment Commander, Assistant Operations Officer, and Headquarters Company Commander during his tenure. He was then selected for duty in the Army Component Element at the United States Army Special Operations Command.

Upon graduating the Command and General Staff College at Fort Leavenworth, Colonel Kirila returned to the 1st Special Forces Group (Airborne) and served as Operations Officer and Executive Officer. In late 2005 he deployed to Iraq in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom where he served as the Director of Forward Operating Base North (FOB-13), Taji, in the heart of Iraq. Here he earned the Bronze Star Medal where he is credited with synchronizing the operations of three diverse centers responsible for supporting combat operations spanning over half of Iraq.

Colonel Kirila's success in Iraq was rewarded with an assignment to the United States Army John F. Kennedy Special Warfare Center & School where he served as Delta Company Commander and was responsible for running the legendary Robin Sage Unconventional Warfare Exercise for the Special

Forces Qualification Course. This was quickly followed by an assignment as the Director of Special Operations Proponency at the United States Special Operation Command in Tampa, Florida.

Since his arrival to the "Red Empire," 7th Special Forces Group (Airborne) in 2009, Colonel Kirila has called North Florida home. Here he initially served as a Battalion Commander and deployed to Afghanistan as the Deputy Commander of Combined Joint Special Operations Task Force-Afghanistan. We are happy to hear he intends to remain as a permanent member of our community upon his retirement and we proudly welcome him.

Colonel Kirila's awards and decorations include the Bronze Star Medal, the Defense Meritorious Service Medal, the Meritorious service Medal with two Oak Leaf Cluster, the Army Commendation Medal with four Oak Leaf Clusters. He has also earned the Special Forces Tab, the Ranger Tab, the Expert Infantryman's Badge, the Senior Parachutist Badge, the Pathfinder Badge, the Air Assault Badge, and the Combat Infantry Badge. His foreign awards include the El Salvadoran Parachutist Badge, the German Basic Parachutist Badge (Bronze) and the Canadian Parachutist Badge.

Mr. Speaker, without question, Colonel Robert M. Kirila, US Army, is retiring with an honorable career on which he can proudly hang his Green Beret. He has touched a number of lives throughout his time both in and out of the military and has given so much back to the country he loves so dear. It is my pleasure to join a grateful Northwest Florida community and Nation in saluting his lifetime of service. My wife, Vicki, and I thank Colonel Kirila; his wife, Chrissie; and daughters, Mia and Lily Agnes; and wish them all the best for continued success.

RECOGNIZING LASALLE-BACKUS
EDUCATION CAMPUS'S COMMIT-
MENT TO STEM EDUCATION

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 2016

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to congratulate the students, parents, and faculty of Lasalle-Backus Education Campus for their commitment to science, technology, engineering, and mathematics enrichment, and for participating in my annual Science and Technology Braintrust.

The teachers at Lasalle-Backus Education Campus are committed to ensuring that our country's youth is exposed to a STEM curriculum, which is paramount to the future of our country. A prevalent theme amongst successful STEM professionals is the curiosity and drive instilled by their teachers at a young age. We must continue to invest in schools that highlight a STEM education, so that all students will have an opportunity to one day be an astrophysicist, doctor, engineer, or a geologist.

Mr. Speaker, Lasalle-Backus Education Campus is a true advocate of STEM education and deserves recognition for its work. With great pride I can say that because of this school's commitment to STEM education, our

country's youth is gaining the skills needed to compete in a rapidly globalizing world.

TRIBUTE TO BOB CRITTENDEN

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 2016

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Bob Crittenden, of Afton, Iowa for being selected as Union County's 2016 inductee into the Iowa 4-H Hall of Fame.

Bob Crittenden is a lifetime resident of Union County. He has been involved with 4-H since becoming a member of the Royal Rustlers 4-H club in 1949 and a volunteer with the organization for 40 years. Bob showed market beef at the Union County Fair and the Iowa State Fair. Since then, he has helped with the beef projects as a mentor to the youth. He also has helped with the weighing, the show ring, and volunteered his talents as an auctioneer on many occasions.

Mr. Speaker, the example set by Bob Crittenden demonstrates the rewards of harnessing one's talents and sharing them with the world. His efforts embody the Iowa spirit and I am honored to represent Bob Crittenden and many Iowans like him in the United States Congress. I know that all of my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives will join me in congratulating Bob Crittenden for his achievements and wish him nothing but continued success.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. LUIS V. GUTIÉRREZ

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 2016

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent in the House chamber for votes on Tuesday, September 20, 2016. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on roll call votes 521, 522 and 523.

PEARLAND'S KRISHNAKUMAR
HEADS BACK TO SCRIPPS NA-
TIONAL SPELLING BEE

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 2016

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Pearland, Texas student Siddharth Krishnakumar for becoming co-champion of the Houston Public Media Spelling Bee—the second largest local bee in the U.S. His accomplishment means a repeat trip to the Scripps National Spelling Bee, where he previously took 4th place in the nation.

Siddharth, an eighth-grader at Pearland Junior High West, won his Spelling Bee title by correctly spelling the word "ineffable." He advances to the Scripps National Spelling Bee in February. We are very proud of Siddharth and wish him luck on the national stage.

On behalf of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations again

to Siddharth for becoming co-champion of the Houston Public Media Spelling Bee. Keep up the great work.

COMMEMORATING THE PASSING
OF CHARLES Z. SMITH

HON. JIM McDERMOTT

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 2016

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to pay tribute to my friend Justice Charles Z. Smith, of Seattle, Washington, who passed away at the age of 89 on Sunday, August 28, 2016. Charles was the first African American state trial judge and Supreme Court justice of Washington State. He was a role model to many, and leaves a trailblazing legacy of social justice and public service.

Charles Zellender Smith was born in Florida in 1927 to an African-American mother who was the daughter of slaves and a Cuban immigrant father. After serving in the U.S. Army Air Corps during World War II, he attended Temple University and graduated in 1952. Charles moved to Seattle and was accepted to the University of Washington Law School. Out of a class of 120, he was the only student of color to graduate in 1955.

His career was a series of firsts: unable to find a law firm to hire him after he graduated, he became the first African-American law clerk for a state Supreme Court justice. In 1965, he became the first African-American to serve as a Seattle municipal court judge, and in 1966, he was the first person of color named to the King County Superior Court bench.

He stepped down to become a professor and associate dean of law at the University of Washington, during which he began a long fight for reparations for Japanese Americans interned in camps during World War II. Later, in private practice, he urged the Seattle City Council to declare the city a "sanctuary city" for refugees from Guatemala and El Salvador.

In 1988, Gov. Booth Gardner appointed Smith to the State Supreme Court and he served until his retirement in 2002. He was known as a thoughtful judge with a reputation for fairness and often was the swing vote in split decisions. From the bench, he spoke eloquently, without notes, and often advocated for immigrant rights and innovative criminal rehabilitation methods.

As well as serving on the Washington State Supreme Court, Justice Smith was a television commentator and president of the American Baptist Churches. In 1999, while still on the Court, President Bill Clinton appointed him to serve on the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom, where he helped develop policies promoting religious freedom and ending the civil war in Sudan.

Mr. Speaker, Justice Smith worked tirelessly for over five decades as an advocate for truth, justice and freedom. He broke down barriers and forged a path for generations to follow. He will be greatly missed.

CONGRATULATIONS TO SARAH HUBBARD FOR BEING AWARDED THE FULBRIGHT SCHOLARSHIP

HON. BILLY LONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 2016

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Walnut Shade, Missouri resident Sarah Hubbard for being awarded the Fulbright Scholarship by the U.S. State Department.

The Fulbright Scholarship program was established by Congress in 1946 and signed into law by President Harry S. Truman. This scholarship was designed to build positive relationships with other countries while allowing recipients to live the day-to-day experiences of other cultures. Sarah Hubbard will join the already 370,000 past participants in this program.

This scholarship is a merit based scholarship that is highly competitive. Founded originally by Senator J. William Fulbright, this grant aims to have educational research and teachings extend beyond the United States.

Sarah Hubbard, who attended John Brown University, will be an English Teaching Assistant and placed in Turkey. She has presented at research conferences since her freshman year and is the first student in John Brown University history to receive the award.

I am honored to recognize Sarah Hubbard, and I congratulate her on receiving the Fulbright Scholarship.

HONORING REAR ADMIRAL JEFFREY TRUSSLER FOR HIS SERVICE AS COMMANDER OF THE UNDERSEA WARFIGHTING DEVELOPMENT CENTER

HON. JOE COURTNEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 2016

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank and congratulate Rear Admiral Jeffrey Trussler on the day of his change of command ceremony for his service as the Commander of the Undersea Warfighting Development Center in Groton, Connecticut. RDML Trussler led the UWDC during a momentous time in Connecticut's history. For the past year, the Groton community has been celebrating the centennial anniversary of Naval Submarine Base New London, the nation's first continental sub base. It has been a joyous and proud time for the Base and the region, as they honor a rich maritime military heritage and the many accomplishments the sailors and the local industry have achieved.

RDML Trussler has been an integral part of this progress during his time in Groton, and a crucial partner during the early planning stages of UWDC. I personally appreciate his active engagement and his ability to see the possibilities for this new warfighting center. As the first Commander of the newly formed UWDC, he took charge as the Navy refocused our warfare centers for our current and future warfighting needs. With his leadership, he focused on antisubmarine warfare and warfighting strategy and training for our entire Naval fleet. His leadership no doubt enhanced

the strategic value of Submarine Base New London, solidifying it as a center of excellence entering the next 100 years.

RDML Trussler came to New London from the Office of the Chief of Naval Operations in Washington, DC. After he leaves New London, he will return to Washington to serve again in the office of the CNO as the Director of Future Plans. I look forward to continue working with RDML Trussler in this new role. Most of all, I thank him for his excellent leadership in Groton, and for his service to our country, our Navy, and the future of undersea warfare.

LETTER FROM CONGRESSIONAL ARMENIAN ISSUES CAUCUS ON ARMENIA'S 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF INDEPENDENCE

HON. FRANK PALLONE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 2016

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the people of Armenia on their 25th anniversary of independence. I include in the RECORD a letter to the President of the Republic of Armenia from the leaders of the Congressional Caucus on Armenian Issues in celebration of this occasion.

SEPTEMBER 21, 2016.

His Excellency SERZH SARGSYAN,
President of the Republic of Armenia.

DEAR PRESIDENT SARGSYAN: As Members of Congress and leaders of the Congressional Caucus on Armenian Issues, we congratulate you and the people of the Republic of Armenia on 25 years of independence from the Soviet Union. On this day, 25 years ago, nearly every Armenian eligible to vote pledged to build a free and proud nation, based on the principles of democracy and a market economy.

In the past quarter century, despite the ongoing blockade of Armenia by two of its four neighbors, the Republic of Armenia has continued to strengthen its democratic institutions, empower civil society, and engage in economic diversification.

Armenia has joined the international community as a member of numerous international organizations including the World Bank, the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, and the World Trade Organization. As a critical regional ally, Armenia is also a strong partner and supporter of U.S.-led peace-keeping missions cooperating on a number of regional and security challenges as a participant in NATO's Partnership for Peace program.

The Republic of Armenia has also consistently championed the right to self-determination of its neighbors in the Nagorno-Karabakh Republic, a right that Artsakh continues to fight for in its steadfast pursuit of regional security and stability despite a tenuous cease fire.

The Congressional Caucus on Armenian Issues stands in solidarity with the peace-loving and resilient people of Armenia. We welcome future opportunities to work closely with the leadership of the Republic of Armenia to bolster the bilateral U.S.-Armenia relationship.

We join our colleagues in Congress, along with the Armenian people and the Armenian-American community across the United States in celebrating 25 years of Armenia's independence. Please accept our best wishes and continued commitment to a strong United States-Armenia partnership.

Sincerely,

FRANK PALLONE, JR.

ROBERT J. DOLD.
JACKIE SPEIER.
DAVID G. VALADAO.
ADAM B. SCHIFF.
DAVID A. TROTT.

TRIBUTE TO ANNA LINKEY

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 2016

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Ms. Anna Linkey on the occasion of her 100th birthday on September 4, 2016.

Our world has changed immensely during the course of Anna's life. Since her birth, we have revolutionized air travel and walked on the moon. We have invented the television, cellular phones and the internet. We have fought in wars overseas, seen the rise and fall of Soviet communism and witnessed the birth of new democracies. Anna has lived through seventeen United States Presidents and twenty-four Governors of Iowa. In her lifetime, the population of the United States has more than tripled.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to represent Anna Linkey in the United States Congress and it is my pleasure to wish her a very happy 100th birthday. I invite my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives to join me in congratulating Anna on reaching this incredible milestone, and wishing her even more health and happiness in the years to come.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE SERVICE OF LIEUTENANT COLONEL ROSEMARIE HUDOCK-WELCH

HON. MATT CARTWRIGHT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 2016

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Lieutenant Colonel Rosemarie Hudock-Welch, who will be retiring from the Pennsylvania Air National Guard after three decades of service. Over the course of her career she has earned multiple awards and decorations, including the Meritorious Service Medal and the Air Force Achievement Medal.

Lieutenant Colonel Hudock-Welch was commissioned to the Air Force Reserve on September 17, 1984. She was assigned to Joint Base McGuire as a flight nurse until 1990. She went on to serve with the 913th Medical Squadron at Willow Grove. As a surgical nurse, Lieutenant Colonel Hudock-Welch was deployed in direct medical support of Operation Iraqi Freedom. In July 2007, Lieutenant Colonel Hudock-Welch was transferred to the 109th Medical New York Air National Guard in Schenectady, NY. During this time, she deployed to Antarctica as part of Operation Deep Freeze. In March 2010, Lieutenant Colonel Hudock-Welch was transferred to 193rd Medical Group and deployed to Afghanistan for direct medical support.

In May 2014, Lieutenant Colonel Hudock-Welch became Officer in Charge of Nursing Services, 193rd Medical Group Pennsylvania Air National Guard. Under her leadership, nursing services personnel were prepared to

provide medical support in response to peacetime or wartime missions at the state or federal level.

It is an honor to recognize Lieutenant Colonel Hudock-Welch for her distinguished military career. Her decades of service are a tremendous contribution to the defense and welfare of our nation. I wish her all the best. May she find fulfillment in her retirement.

REMEMBERING LINDA DUPREE

HON. KEVIN YODER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 2016

Mr. YODER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember the life of Co-Pastor Linda Dannella Dupree of Kansas City, Kansas. Linda was a lifelong resident of KCK and an example to us all in the 3rd District of Kansas.

Co-Pastor Dupree was born on February 4, 1955 in Kansas City, KS. She would live almost her whole life in Kansas, where she met her husband of 44 years, Alvin T. Dupree, Sr. Together, they raised a large family with many children, including many foster children, grandchildren, and great-grandchildren.

As a missionary and Co-Pastor, she served her church and her community faithfully for many years. Co-Pastor Dupree wore many hats in her different roles in the church, but her goal was always to help others. Her decades of service impacted countless people in Kansas City.

Our community is a better place because of Linda. She will be greatly missed by many, but her legacy lives on in her family and in the lives of those she helped. On behalf of this great body, I commemorate the well-lived life of Linda Dupree and extend my condolences to her entire family, who remain in my thoughts and prayers this week.

RECOGNIZING RON BROWN HIGH SCHOOL'S COMMITMENT TO STEM EDUCATION

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 2016

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to congratulate the students, parents, and faculty of Ron Brown High School for their commitment to science, technology, engineering, and mathematics enrichment, and for participating in my annual Science and Technology Braintrust.

The teachers at Ron Brown High School are committed to ensuring that our country's youth is exposed to a STEM curriculum, which is paramount to the future of our country. A prevalent theme amongst successful STEM professionals is the curiosity and drive instilled by their teachers at a young age. We must continue to invest in schools that highlight a STEM education, so that all students will have an opportunity to one day be an astrophysicist, doctor, engineer, or a geologist.

Mr. Speaker, Ron Brown High School is a true advocate of STEM education and deserves recognition for its work. With great pride I can say that because of this school's

commitment to STEM education, our country's youth is gaining the skills needed to compete in a rapidly globalizing world.

HONORING SARRAH BUSHARA

HON. ERIK PAULSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 2016

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Sarrah Bushara, a young 18 year old oboist from Eden Prairie, for being selected to Carnegie Hall's National Youth Orchestra—United States of America program.

Sarrah participated in a competitive audition process and was judged on her technical ability, musicianship, passion, and intellectual curiosity along with other musicians her age. After she was selected, Sarrah took part in a three-week residency, which included orchestral rehearsals, musical workshops, and a performance in Carnegie Hall.

After their residency, Sarrah and the rest of the National Youth Orchestra embarked on a European tour in July to perform at concert halls in Amsterdam, Montpellier, Copenhagen, and Prague.

Mr. Speaker, our community is extremely proud of Sarrah; her skills with the oboe earned her a place in this prestigious youth orchestra. I offer her my congratulations on her musical success and I wish her well in her musical endeavors.

COMMEMORATING THE PASSING OF BOB SANTOS

HON. JIM McDERMOTT

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 2016

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to pay tribute to my dear friend Bob Santos, of Seattle, Washington, who passed away at the age of 82 on Saturday, August 27, 2016. Mostly referred to as "Uncle Bob" and unofficial mayor of the International District, Bob fought to improve and preserve the neighborhood for over five decades.

In the late 1960s and 1970s, Mr. Santos joined Larry Gossett, Bernie Whitebear, and Roberto Maestas to form an activist group: "The Gang of Four". Rather than competing for limited resources, the group unified communities of color to fight for equal rights in Seattle.

Robert "Bob" Santos was born in Seattle on February 25, 1934, to parents of Filipino and Tlingit Nation heritage. He became aware of discrimination as a young child. In 1942, his elementary school closed when the majority of his classmates, who were of Japanese descent, were taken to internment camps. He recalled wearing an 'I am Filipino' badge to avoid anti-Japanese violence.

Mr. Santos became involved in activism in 1963, when black activist Walter Hubbard Jr. invited him to join a march supporting open housing.

He later became known for his ties to the International District Improvement Association (Inter*Im). Over the course of three decades, his leadership in the organization helped add

over 1,000 low-income residential units to the neighborhood. His advocacy also fought for the soul of the International District by starting a community produce garden, rehabilitating dilapidated apartment buildings and fending off unwanted developments such as a trash-burning plant and a prison.

He continued to fight fearlessly for equal job opportunities and better educational opportunities for people of color and was arrested six times in the process. In 2005, Partners for Livable Communities awarded the Gang of Four with a Bridge Builders Award for their work for minority populations of King County. In 2006, the Seattle City Council recognized Mr. Santos for his work with Inter*Im.

Mr. Speaker, throughout his decades of advocacy, Mr. Santos never lost his sense of humor or his fondness for karaoke, especially songs by Frank Sinatra and Elvis. I will miss his vigorous spirit and his passion for social justice. He changed the city of Seattle for the better and he did it "his way".

TRIBUTE TO DONNA AND LYLE CROZIER

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 2016

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Donna and Lyle Crozier on the very special occasion of their 65th wedding anniversary.

Donna and Lyle were married on August 18, 1951 at the Reorganized Church of Latter Day Saints in Centerville, Iowa. The Crozier's make their home in Waukee, Iowa. Their lifelong commitment to each other and their two children, four grandchildren, five great grandchildren, and one great, great granddaughter 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.

Mr. Speaker, 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.

MACKENZIE DUCK WINS NATIONAL CHAMPIONSHIP AT AAU JUNIOR OLYMPICS

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 2016

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Mackenzie Duck of Katy, TX for winning the national championship at the Amateur Athletic Union (AAU) Junior Olympics.

Mackenzie and her Track Houston teammates, Nia Reed, Alexa Granderson and Jessica Gordon, raced in the 3,200 meter relay with a time of 9 minutes, 34.70 seconds to win the victorious national championship title. Mackenzie is a junior at Cinco Ranch High School and is a part of the school's cross country team as well.

On behalf of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations again to Mackenzie Duck for her national championship win at the AAU Junior Olympics. We are proud of her for bringing this win home to Katy and wish her luck with her future track and field and cross country career.

A HAPPY DOUBLE TEN DAY TO
THE PEOPLE OF TAIWAN

HON. STEVE KING

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 2016

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, Monday, October 10 is Taiwan's National Day—also known as Double Ten Day. As the House will not be in session that day, I would like to take this opportunity now to offer my early best wishes to the people of Taiwan.

As my colleagues are aware, Taiwan is a both close friend and security partner of the United States. Accordingly, the United States has declared its support for Taiwan's meaningful participation in international organizations where its membership is not possible. One of the organizations in question is the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO), which works to secure the development of civil aviation throughout the world.

As a key aviation hub in East Asia, up to 58 million people each year enter, leave, or pass through the Taipei Flight Information Region, and Taiwan is connected to over 100 cities around the world with hundreds of air-passenger and air-freight routes. If an organization is to set the standards and regulations necessary for aviation safety and security, then surely everybody must be at the table. Taiwan's absence neither serves Taiwan, nor the international community.

Mr. Speaker, again, I wish the people of Taiwan a Happy Double Ten Day. I hope we may also celebrate Taiwan's presence at ICAO in Montreal this year as well.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 25TH AN-
NIVERSARY OF SACRAMENTO
STAND DOWN ASSOCIATION

HON. DORIS O. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 2016

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Sacramento Stand Down Association as they embark on their 25th annual event. As supporters of this organization gather to serve our veteran community, I ask all my colleagues to join me in honoring the Sacramento Stand Down Association for their incredible service to the homeless veterans of the Sacramento region.

For over two decades, Sacramento Stand Down has been a vital resource for thousands of homeless veterans in the Sacramento Region. The annual three day event brings together a varied support system of local and federal service providers from around the region where a veteran can reach all of his or her needs in a single visit. Stand Down participants assist homeless veterans with reconnecting to civilian life by providing copies of

essential documentation such as driver's licenses, discharge papers, and military IDs needed to access services. Participants have access to housing organizations, County services, and VA medical health centers.

Sacramento Stand Down has provided a safe and comfortable environment where veterans can connect with other individuals who understand and share their experiences. The resources gathered here at Stand Down are so transformative; many "graduates" of previous years return to support other homeless veterans. This event creates a temporary community that creates long lasting results. The Sacramento region is forever grateful for the Stand Down event and its dedicated organizers.

Mr. Speaker, as the participants and partners of Sacramento Stand Down gather to provide life-altering services, I ask all my colleagues to join me in honoring them for their unwavering commitment to homeless veterans in the Sacramento Region.

125TH ANNIVERSARY OF SAND
CREEK COMMUNITY CHURCH

HON. TIM WALBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 2016

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the 125th Anniversary of Sand Creek Community Church, a small country church committed to spreading the good news of the gospel.

Located in Lenawee County, Michigan, Sand Creek Community Church is a passionate, close-knit, congregation that meets on Sunday mornings in a one-story, white framed building.

The storied history of the church dates back to 1891, when the Free Will Baptist Church first incorporated in Sand Creek. From 1891 to 1920, the Free Will Baptist group—whose roots traced back to 1854—called the church home. After the building remained empty for a number of years, the second and present congregation was established in 1943. After a letter of organization was circulated through the community, area residents came together to form a new nondenominational church, Sand Creek Community.

Today, the congregation is guided by Pastor Jamie Driskill, who serves alongside his wife Heidi and two children, Elizabeth and Chloe. Pastor Driskill, who also works in the Special Education Department in Sand Creek Schools, previously served as a missionary in Budapest, Hungary with his family.

Throughout the years, Sand Creek Community Church has earned a distinguished reputation for their service to the community. Through the Ladies Aid Society, Vacation Bible School, local charitable donations, and various missionary activities, the church has remained a consistent positive influence in the community.

I wish to extend my deepest congratulations to the present and former members of Sand Creek Community Church on their 125th anniversary.

Although they may appear to be a small country church, Sand Creek Community has been a bright light with great impact that continues to shine in the community. May God

continue to bless and use the ministry of Sand Creek Community Church.

CONGRATULATIONS TO JONAS
ARJES FOR BEING RECOGNIZED
AS THE 2016 PROFESSIONAL ECO-
NOMIC DEVELOPER OF THE
YEAR

HON. BILLY LONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 2016

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Jonas Arjes, the Executive Director of the four-year-old Taney County Partnership. Jonas was recognized as the 2016 Professional Economic Developer of the Year at the Missouri Economic Development Council (MEDC) conference on June 15th.

Jonas started off his career in the restaurant business by managing the Plantation restaurant in Branson in the mid-1990s before going on to own and operate a Schlotzky's Deli franchise from 2000 to 2007. In August 2007, Jonas became a risk and benefits adviser with the Branson insurance firm Akers & Arney, where he worked until 2012. In January 2012, Jonas was named the Executive Director of the Taney County Partnership.

As Executive Director, Jonas is currently leading Branson through a strong reinvestment cycle with more than \$300 million in new investments for 2016. Some of the projects that Jonas has played a critical role in include the Ball Parks of America Baseball Resort for players and coaches from the 10U to the 13U level, the Air Service Development committee which has raised millions of dollars to secure air service to Branson, and Project Bigfoot, a 225-foot free fall tower attraction.

Mr. Speaker, Jonas Arjes is a shining example of the business acumen that makes America the great country it is. I would like to extend my thanks, both personally and on behalf of the 7th District, for his integral role in the economic development of the Branson area. I urge my colleagues to join me as I congratulate Jonas on this well-deserved award.

DAVID WILLIAMS—FINALIST FOR
ENTREPRENEUR OF THE YEAR
AWARD

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 2016

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate David Williams of Sugar Land, TX for being named a finalist for the EY Entrepreneur of the Year Award for the Gulf Coast Area.

Mr. Williams is the President and CEO of Noble Corporation, an offshore drilling contractor for the oil and gas industry. As a proud Aggie, Williams is a finalist thanks to his hard work and dedication in his industry. This award recognizes outstanding entrepreneurs who demonstrate excellence and extraordinary success in innovation, financial performance and commitment to their business and communities. We are lucky to have Mr. William's talent and dedication help our area remain at

the forefront of job-creation, technology and scientific discovery.

On behalf of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations and thank you to David Williams for his innovation, dedication and work with Noble Corporation. Keep up the great work.

RECOGNIZING BLACK ARCHITECT
JULIAN ABELE AND THE NAMING
OF ABELE QUAD AT DUKE
UNIVERSITY

HON. G.K. BUTTERFIELD

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 2016

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the contributions of Mr. Julian Abele, the African American architect of Duke University's original campus, located in Durham, North Carolina.

In recognition of Julian Abele's role at Duke University, a ceremony will be held on Friday, September 30, 2016 to celebrate the naming of the main quadrangle on West Campus as Abele Quad. In 2015, Duke students presented the need to recognize Abele and the Board of Trustees unanimously approved the naming of Abele Quad.

Mr. Speaker, Julian Abele is the youngest of eight children raised in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. He studied at the University of Pennsylvania, where he became the first African American to graduate from the University's Graduate School of Fine Arts. Following graduation in 1906, Abele was hired as an architect at the firm of American architect Horace Trumbauer. There, Abele became chief designer in 1909. Abele was admitted into the American Institute of Architects in 1942.

Records indicate that Julian Abele provided the guiding vision for Duke's West Campus between 1924 and 1935. He is credited for the design of several well-known buildings on Duke's campus, including Duke Chapel, Cameron Indoor Stadium, and the West Campus quads. In 1988, a portrait of Abele was hung in the lobby of the Allen Building, which was Abele's last creation prior to his death in 1950.

Abele Quad will span the area from the steps leading to the Clock Tower Quad, Davison Quad, and the Chapel Quad—an area that is home to more than thirty buildings and spaces designed by Julian Abele. A marker will be placed at the center of the Quad to inform visitors that every surrounding building is the work of Abele's hand.

It is with great pride that I acknowledge the contributions of Mr. Julian Abele and the naming of Abele Quad on the campus of Duke University. Abele Quad will let everyone who studies, lives, works, and visits Duke's campus be reminded of Mr. Julian Abele, a talented Black architect who played a significant role in the University's creation during the country's darkest days of racial segregation.

TRIBUTE TO EAGLE SCOUT
BRENNAN T. PLUMMER

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 2016

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Brennan T. Plummer of Council Bluffs, Iowa for achieving the rank of Eagle Scout. Brennan is a member of Boy Scout Troop 249 in Council Bluffs.

The Eagle Scout designation is the highest advancement rank in scouting. Approximately five 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 Project to benefit the community. Brennan's Eagle Project coordinated a work crew at Emanuel Lutheran Church. The work crew constructed a gaga pit for the church. Brennan has held several leadership roles in Troop 249 such as patrol leader, historian, and senior patrol leader. The work ethic Brennan has shown in his Eagle Project, and every other project leading to his Eagle Scout rank, speaks volumes of 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 demonstrates the rewards of hard work, dedication, and perseverance. I am honored to represent Brennan and his family in the United States Congress. I know that all of my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives join me in congratulating him on obtaining the Eagle Scout ranking, and I wish him continued success in his future education and career.

COMMEMORATING THE PASSING
OF PAT GOGERTY

HON. JIM McDERMOTT

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 2016

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, it is with great admiration that I rise today to honor the memory of my friend Pat Gogerty, who passed away August 26, 2016 at the age of 86. Pat was a pioneer in child welfare advocacy and created Childhaven, a program that changed the lives of countless abused children in Seattle and continues to serve as a national model for therapeutic child abuse programs.

Patrick "Pat" Gogerty was born September 12, 1929 in Oregon and raised in Seattle. Physically abused by his father, and placed in foster care several times, Mr. Gogerty had a natural understanding of the abused children for which he would become an advocate.

After serving in the Army, he became the director of Seattle Day Nursery in 1973 and fully transformed it from a daycare into an effective center for early intervention and therapy. The key tenets of the program continue to this day: three hot meals, an on-site nurse, speech, physical and play therapy, as well as support and education for parents.

With the help of his brother, Seattle Deputy Mayor Bob Gogerty, Pat obtained funding for the program. Mr. Gogerty worked to identify abused children under the age of five. When parents were unable or unwilling to bring them to the center, he arranged for them to be transported to the center in a van. At the time, treating children regardless of parental participation was a revolutionary concept, but Mr. Gogerty proved it effective. In 1979, he commissioned a longitudinal study that found after 10 years, the children from Seattle Day Nursery were found to be significantly less likely to be involved in criminal activity than children from other state programs.

Mr. Gogerty became a master of public relations and Seattle Day Nursery began to receive national attention. Shortly before changing its name to Childhaven, it was the subject of a major article in *Life* magazine. When funding for the program was threatened in 1985, I stood on the State House floor and read the story featured in the article, a child saved by Childhaven. The boy had broken his arm saving his brother, who had been put in the dryer by their mother as punishment for wetting his pants. Childhaven subsequently retained its funding.

In 1992, The Patrick L. Gogerty branch of Childhaven opened in the city of Auburn, WA. Upon his 1998 retirement, Mr. Gogerty was recognized in a *Seattle Times* editorial titled "Fighting for Kids Unable to Fight for Themselves."

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Gogerty was an advocate for the defenseless. His legacy will live on in the Childhaven, its renowned model of care and the children whose lives he helped change. His lifetime of kindness and advocacy left an indelible mark on the state of Washington and he will be dearly missed.

IN HONOR OF THE NEW MOUNT
PLEASANT MISSIONARY BAPTIST
CHURCH 126TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. MIKE ROGERS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 2016

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the House's attention to recognize the 126th Anniversary of the New Mount Pleasant Missionary Baptist Church.

During the early years of the church, services were held in a log building under the leadership of Rev. Tom Williams. Many years have passed since then, and pastors have come and gone. The church has seen more than a century of change and growth. Much of that growth would not have been realized without the leadership of two of the church's most recent pastors, William Jones and Anthony Williams.

In William Jones' 27 years as pastor, his accomplishments were many. Improvements to the church included the additions of a Junior Usher Board and a third Sunday service. Most notably, he was able to secure a property to build a more up-to date church that could better accommodate the recent growth. The dedication service for the new location on County Road 13 was held on November 27, 2005, and is still in use today.

Since 2012, Rev. Anthony Williams has proudly served the church. Taking over where

Jones left off, he continues to improve and grow the church. Pastor Williams added a modern touch, introducing morning devotion via text and email to better keep in contact with the church family. In addition to this, Pastor Williams has implemented more community programs and outreach. The church has an active role in helping to strengthen and improve the community.

In this 126th year of New Mount Pleasant Missionary Baptist Church, progress is still being made for the betterment of the church.

Please join me in congratulating them on their 126th anniversary.

RECOGNIZING HOWARD UNIVERSITY MIDDLE SCHOOL'S COMMITMENT TO STEM EDUCATION

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 2016

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to congratulate the students, parents, and faculty of Howard University Middle School for their commitment to science, technology, engineering, and mathematics enrichment, and for participating in my annual Science and Technology Braintrust.

The teachers at Howard University Middle School are committed to ensuring that our country's youth is exposed to a STEM curriculum, which is paramount to the future of our country. A prevalent theme amongst successful STEM professionals is the curiosity and drive instilled by their teachers at a young age. We must continue to invest in schools that highlight a STEM education, so that all students will have an opportunity to one day be an astrophysicist, doctor, engineer, or a geologist.

Mr. Speaker, Howard University Middle School is a true advocate of STEM education and deserves recognition for its work. With great pride I can say that because of this school's commitment to STEM education, our country's youth is gaining the skills needed to compete in a rapidly globalizing world.

TRIBUTE TO DAVID FULTON

HON. LUKE MESSER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 2016

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the life, legacy and accomplishments of David Fulton of Centerville, Indiana. At the age of 73, David passed away surrounded by his loved ones.

A longtime educator and volunteer in Wayne County, David was the fourth chancellor of Indiana University East and recipient of the IU President's Medal for Excellence in honor of his 36-year-long career of service to the university.

Beginning his teaching career at Earlham College in 1971, David was promoted to an assistant professor in history and political science and held several administrative positions before becoming Indiana University East's chancellor in 1995. Fulton is credited with fostering local partnerships in the commu-

nity as well as managing significant campus growth, most notably the construction of Springwood Hall in Richmond, the Connersville Center and the Danielson Learning Center in New Castle. He held this role until his retirement in 2007.

In addition to teaching, David will also be remembered for his devoted volunteer efforts on behalf of the Starr-Gennett Foundation. David joined the nonprofit foundation's board in 1999, served as president from 2001 to 2003, and then worked as treasurer for 13 years before his passing. The organization tirelessly promotes Richmond's musical heritage, and Fulton's involvement at Starr-Gennett mirrored his passion for showcasing Richmond's musical talent nationwide. Specifically, David had a vital role in the development of the Gennett Walk of Fame, honoring artists who recorded at Gennett's local studio. Additionally, he was heavily involved in generating a working partnership between Starr-Gennett and the Archives of Traditional Music at IU Bloomington, digitizing over 600 songs recorded at the studio.

Fulton also served his community in many other capacities, including his membership on the Wayne Bank and Trust, the Planning Group CEO Roundtable of the Richmond Wayne County Chamber of Commerce, the IU Foundation Development Committee, the Board of Historic Landmarks of Indiana and the Greater Richmond Progress Committee. Further, Fulton served on the Community Services Council, Social Services Planning Board, and he was a member of the Reid Hospital and Health Care Services Board from 2001 to 2004.

I thank David for his steadfast commitment to the community, and I know both the residents of Wayne County and the student body of IU East will always be grateful for his selfless contributions.

Today, it is my privilege to honor the life of David Fulton, who is survived by his loving wife Marilyn. My thoughts and prayers go out to David's family, and may God comfort those he left behind with His peace and strength.

RECOGNIZING THE IMPORTANCE OF ADVOCATING FOR THOSE WITH ALZHEIMER'S AND DEMENTIA

HON. MICHAEL G. FITZPATRICK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 2016

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the following letter by Michael Ellenbogen.

I am so thankful to be still here. Many of my friends who were living with dementia have died and others are no longer capable of speaking. I am one of the lucky ones. My Alzheimer's is progressing very slowly. While that is good news it is also bad news. I will be forced to endure the worst part of this disease even longer than most. Knowing what I know now that will be like being tortured until I die. While I try to stay positive these days and live life to the fullest, I am in pain every day from the frustration of not being able to be the person I was once. I continue to decline in to a childlike state.

Dementia, including Alzheimer's, is the most expensive disease we face. It is costing us more than heart disease and cancer. It is

the third cause of death in the United States; more than 500,000 people die from Alzheimer's each year! We all get caught up in the big numbers, so I will break them down so they are more relatable.

41,666 is the average monthly death rate;

9,615 is the average weekly death rate;

1,369 is the average daily death rate;

57 is the average hourly death rate.

This is equivalent to almost three 747s crashing every day. Yet there is much neglect and discrimination regarding funding for Alzheimer's and related dementia research.

Preventative measures for breast cancer, heart disease and HIV have all made tremendous progress since the federal government made significant investments into research. Comparable investments must be made for dementia so we can accomplish the same successes, while saving millions of lives and trillions of dollars.

If we don't act now this disease has the potential to bankrupt this county. This is the most expensive disease in America. In 2016 \$236 billion will be spent on Alzheimer's in terms of care and medication, with Medicaid and Medicare spending \$160 billion. And unless you take action, the cost to Medicare alone will increase 365 percent to \$589 billion by 2050.

Our investment today will lead to huge savings for the government and public, not to mention the lives saved. People with dementia are faced with discrimination at many levels and they lose their civil rights. That must change; we are still people and deserve to be treated as such. A person with cancer would never be treated the way we are. We need you to start making more of an effort to educate the public and restore our rights.

A few years ago I would have said I had no hope, but that has changed to 2.5 percent. I do believe we are closer to a cure today based on what has been learned from all the failures. I am so grateful that the budget has been increased to \$991 million, but that is still far short of the two billion dollars that was said was needed years ago.

In my opinion we need a czar for dementia just like Vice President Joe Biden is to cancer and it sure worked for HIV. We are definitely at the tipping point. You have the power to make this happen. Please, I implore the House of Representatives, the Senate and the respective appropriations committees: Make the hard choices; increase funding for Alzheimer's disease by at least one billion dollars. Do everything necessary to ensure that Alzheimer's disease gets the exposure, commitment and funding necessary to change the course of the disease.

If you have not yet been touched by this devastating and debilitating disease it's just a matter of time.

Regards,

MICHAEL ELLENBOGEN,
(Advocate for all of those living with dementia, who can no longer speak, write, or have passed).

TRIBUTE TO JANET AND ROBERT KESSLER

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 2016

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Janet and Robert Kessler on the very special occasion of their 60th wedding anniversary.

Janet and Robert were married on August 27, 1956 and make their home in Creston, 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.

Mr. Speaker, 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.

TRIBUTE TO KARLA LOUISE
GRIESER

HON. KEN BUCK

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 2016

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to mourn the passing of Karla Louise Grieser on August 26th, 2016. A longtime resident of Colorado, Karla was well known in her church and community.

Karla was born in Wauseon, Ohio on April 18th, 1944. In 1965 she married her sweetheart Merle Grieser, and they moved to Colorado together in 1969. Karla worked as an accountant for KLZ Radio and Television for several years, but her family always remained her number one priority.

From a young age Karla devoted herself to helping others. She went to school to be a nurse, an education focused on healing the sick, caring for others, and ministering those in need. I have seen the passion in Karla's heart for nurturing, supporting, and protecting those who couldn't defend themselves.

Karla was a leader in the pro-life movement. She started the life chain in Greeley, where hundreds of volunteers lined the streets to pray and support the sanctity of human life. I have seen firsthand how Karla's fight for the pro-life movement was not only God's calling, but her way of protecting the most vulnerable in our society.

The life chain was just the beginning for Karla's commitment to protecting the unborn. She led the monumental task of founding The Genesis Project of Northern Colorado, a faith based non-profit in the Greeley area. This organization provides shelter, support, and spiritual guidance for numerous women and children to this day.

It was clear Karla cared about more than providing basic necessities; it was about helping those women and children become an asset in their community. I sat in many Genesis board meetings, and it was clear Karla was giving these single mothers a second chance at life.

Karla held many other prominent positions in her community, all of which helped improve the lives of those around her. She was President of Weld County Right to Life, actively involved with the Weld County Republicans, and helped at several children's ministries. Due to her continued work to better the community, Karla was invited to help revise the Comprehensive Plan for Weld County. Karla devoted her life to improving Colorado, and she left a positive influence on everybody she met.

It is the values Karla embodied throughout her life that makes Colorado the best place to

live in the country. I extend my deepest condolences to Karla's friends and family for their loss.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to recognize Karla Louise Grieser for her commitment to Jesus Christ, family, and Colorado. She will be sorely missed.

HONORING BYRON KENT
MAXFIELD

HON. TODD ROKITA

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 2016

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember a dear friend and a distinguished Hoosier and army veteran. I have been honored to be a part of his family for decades now.

Mr. Kent Maxfield passed away on Friday, September 9. Mr. Maxfield was a veteran of the U.S. Army where he served with the "Big Red One" 1st Infantry Division in Vietnam from 1967 through 1968. Mr. Maxfield often talked of the bible he carried throughout his time in combat and how reading it helped him get through the daily mortar attacks and fire-fights.

Kent worked for many years in corporate real estate working for such companies as Arby's, Applebee's, Pizza Hut, and Sonic Restaurants. He was a 1981 graduate of Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis where he earned a degree in Business Administration. Since retiring in 2007, Mr. Maxfield spent time volunteering with the "Warriors-Hope" Group which provides peer support from a biblical perspective.

Last year, Kent, along with his 3 daughters; Laura, Lisa, and Cheri, traveled back to Vietnam. Through the Global Ministries People to People Mission, Mr. Maxfield was able to return to the country he had not seen for 47 years, but this time he had love in his heart. During his trip, Mr. Maxwell visited several orphanages and provided \$5000 in scholarships for Vietnamese youth to study social work.

Mr. Maxfield's passing is a loss for the State of Indiana and our nation. We are grateful for his service and his leadership. I look forward to seeing those same characteristics in his grandchildren. I pray for his family and all who knew Kent.

ANDREW GANDY WINS THE NA-
TIONAL CHAMPIONSHIP AT AAU
JUNIOR OLYMPICS

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 2016

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Andrew Gandy of Katy, TX for winning the national championship at the Amateur Athletic Union (AAU) Junior Olympics.

Andrew's winning time of 9 minutes, 12.46 seconds in the 3,000 meter run earned him the prestigious national championship title. However, a couple of weeks later, the Seven Lakes High School junior won yet another national championship at the Cy Woods XC Invi-

tational in the 3,200 meter race, with a time of 10 minutes, 29.68 seconds.

On behalf of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations again to Andrew Gandy for his national championship win at the AAU Junior Olympics. We are proud of him for bringing this win home to Katy and wish him luck with his future cross country career.

RECOGNIZING EASTERN SENIOR
HIGH SCHOOL'S COMMITMENT TO
STEM EDUCATION

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 2016

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to congratulate the students, parents, and faculty of Eastern Senior High School for their commitment to science, technology, engineering, and mathematics enrichment, and for participating in my annual Science and Technology Braintrust.

The teachers at Eastern Senior High School are committed to ensuring that our country's youth is exposed to a STEM curriculum, which is paramount to the future of our country. A prevalent theme amongst successful STEM professionals is the curiosity and drive instilled by their teachers at a young age. We must continue to invest in schools that highlight a STEM education, so that all students will have an opportunity to one day be an astrophysicist, doctor, engineer, or a geologist.

Mr. Speaker, Eastern Senior High School is a true advocate of STEM education and deserves recognition for its work. With great pride I can say that because of this school's commitment to STEM education, our country's youth is gaining the skills needed to compete in a rapidly globalizing world.

TRIBUTE TO BETTY AND PAUL
SHOMSHOR, SR.

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 2016

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Betty and Paul Shomshor, Sr. of Crescent, Iowa on the very special occasion of their 50th wedding anniversary. They were married on July 17, 1966 at Fifth Avenue Methodist Church in Council Bluffs.

Betty and Paul's lifelong commitment to each other and their children and grandchildren, truly embodies Iowa values. As they reflect on their 50th anniversary, I hope it is filled with happy memories. May their commitment grow even stronger, as they continue to love, cherish, and honor one another for many years to come.

Mr. Speaker, 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 will join me in congratulating them on this momentous occasion.

CONGRATULATIONS TO RACHEL
SCHOBER FOR BEING AWARDED
THE FULBRIGHT SCHOLARSHIP

HON. BILLY LONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 2016

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Springfield, Missouri resident Rachel Schober for being awarded the Fulbright Scholarship by the U.S. State Department.

The Fulbright Scholarship program was established by Congress in 1946 and signed into law by President Harry S. Truman. This scholarship was designed to build positive relationships with other countries while allowing recipients to live the day-to-day experiences of other cultures. Rachel Schober will join the already 370,000 past participants in this program.

This scholarship is a merit based scholarship that is highly competitive. Founded originally by Senator J. William Fulbright, this grant aims to have educational research and teaching extend beyond the United States.

Rachel Schober, who attended Missouri State University, will be an English Teaching Assistant and placed in the Czech Republic. She is currently a graduate assistant at the Ozarks Writing Project, an affiliate of the National Writing Project, and has also spent the past two years visiting schools in the area and helping students and teachers improve classroom performance.

I am honored to recognize Rachel Schober, and I congratulate her on receiving the Fulbright Scholarship.

HONORING THE LIFE OF SALLY
HOWLAND

HON. BILL FOSTER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 2016

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Sally Howland, a longtime activist from my district, who passed away on May 19, 2016.

For more than 20 years, Sally dedicated her life to advancing equality and non-discrimination for the lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender community. A two-time recipient of the State Presidential Award, Sally became a leader in transgender issues long before it became a major national movement, working with schools and churches to address the issues of acceptance, bullying, and harassment.

Sally touched the lives of many members of the community in incredible ways. She was the founder of the Questioning Youth Center, located in the western suburbs of Chicago, which to this day continues to provide a safe and supportive environment for adolescents that may identify as gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgender, or queer.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in celebrating the life and legacy of Sally Howland. Her unwavering commitment to the LGBTQ community shall never be forgotten.

RECOGNIZING TAIWAN'S NATIONAL
DAY

HON. MICK MULVANEY

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 2016

Mr. MULVANEY. Mr. Speaker, Monday, October 10, is Taiwan's National Day—also known as Double Ten Day. As the House will not be in session that day, I would like to take this opportunity to offer my early best wishes to the people of Taiwan.

Taiwan is a friend, an ally, and a vital security partner of the United States. As such, it should be able to participate and engage fully in the international community, and in international forums, such as the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO).

Three years ago, I supported legislation—that the President signed into law—directing the Secretary of State to develop a strategy to obtain observer status for Taiwan in ICAO. Taiwan was indeed invited to attend as a guest that year. However, the ICAO's 39th Triennial Assembly will be taking place shortly in Montreal, and to date, there has been no indication that Taiwan will be able to participate. ICAO works to secure the development of civil aviation throughout the world, and as a key aviation hub in East Asia, Taiwan should be an indispensable member of that dialogue. Unfortunately, as of today, it is not.

Up to 58 million people each year enter, leave, or pass through the Taipei Flight Information Region, and Taiwan is connected to over 100 cities around the world with hundreds of air-passenger and air-freight routes.

If an international organization is to set the standards and regulations necessary for aviation safety and security across the globe, then Taiwan must be at the table. Taiwan's absence neither serves Taiwan nor the international community.

Taiwan's invitation to participate in 2013 came virtually at the last minute. I hope we are not kept waiting as long this time and the current leadership of ICAO gives this prompt attention. I call upon my colleagues and the Administration to prioritize Taiwan's observer status at ICAO.

Again, I wish the people of Taiwan a Happy Double Ten Day. I hope we may also celebrate Taiwan's presence at ICAO in Montreal this year.

TRIBUTE TO JUANITA AND
WESLEY BLUME

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 2016

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Juanita and Wesley Blume of Clarinda, Iowa on the very special occasion of their 55th wedding anniversary. They celebrated their anniversary on July 23, 2016.

Juanita and Wesley's lifelong commitment to each other and their family truly embodies Iowa values. As they reflect on their 55th anniversary, I hope it is filled with happy memories. May their commitment grow even stronger, as they continue to love, cherish, and honor one another for many years to come.

Mr. Speaker, I commend this great couple on their 55th year 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.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE NJ RUN
FOR THE FALLEN

HON. FRANK PALLONE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 2016

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the NJ Run for the Fallen, scheduled for September 21–25, 2016. The NJ Run for the Fallen honors fallen service members from New Jersey and their families. It is my honor to recognize this tribute and to extend my appreciation to its organizers, participants and all of our military members and their families for their service and sacrifice.

While the NJ Run for the Fallen honors all fallen military men and women, it specifically remembers those from New Jersey killed in recent military conflicts. Each mile of the run represents and memorializes a service member with a Hero Marker, where family members, loved ones, veterans and other supporters will be gathered. The runners will stop for a presentation and salute of the individual's memory.

The 2016 run team consists of more than 20 active duty service members from across the state and from all branches of the military. They will travel nearly 200 miles from Cape May to Holmdel over four days, ending at the New Jersey Vietnam Veterans' Memorial.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope that my colleagues will join me in recognizing the NJ Run for the Fallen and thanking the organizers, participants and supporters for their efforts to honor our military heroes and their families. This tribute is an important reminder of the sacrifices our service members and their families. I am truly grateful for their duty, selflessness and patriotism and thank all of our military members and veterans for their service.

SUPPORT OF TAIWAN'S PARTICI-
PATION IN THE UPCOMING
INTERNATIONAL CIVIL AVIATION
ORGANIZATION

HON. MIKE BISHOP

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 2016

Mr. BISHOP of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of Taiwan's participation in the upcoming International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) assembly next Tuesday, September 27, 2016. Taiwan is a good friend to the United States. Our shared values include respect for market institutions, democracy, free elections, and human rights. In 2013, Congress passed H.R. 1151, which became Public Law 113–17. This law called for Taiwan's participation in the triennial International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) assembly as an observer. With wide international support, Taiwan was indeed able to attend, and observe, the 38th ICAO Assembly.

This year, I hope to again see Taiwan included in the Assembly. To highlight the importance, I would like to quote an article by Stanley Kao, Representative of TECRO in the United States, for Taiwan's participation in ICAO.

"Taiwan needs to be part of ICAO because it is an indispensable player in global aviation safety. The Taipei Flight Information Region (FIR), which is administered by Taiwan's Civil Aeronautics Administration (CAA), covers 180,000 nm and borders four other FIRs: Fukuoka, Manila, Hong Kong and Shanghai. In 2015, Taiwan's CAA provided over 1.53 million instances of air traffic control services and handled 58 million incoming and outgoing passengers."

"Despite its location in the busiest section of airspace in East Asia, Taiwan's CAA has had no direct access to ICAO for the past 40 years and has only indirectly gained information, in some cases incomplete, on ICAO regulations and standards related to safety, management, security and environmental protection. The CAA has had to resort to various informal channels to keep up with the development of ICAO's regulations and standards and overcome the difficulties associated with a lack of transparency in order to maintain adequate safety levels and service standards in the Taipei FIR. The CAA has had to make an extra effort to keep abreast of constant updates to flight safety and security standards set by ICAO. Obtaining that information often has been a costly and drawn-out process."

As East Asia's busiest airspace, it not only makes sense that Taiwan should have access to the latest technologies and standards in civil aviation safety; it is a matter of public safety. Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge the international community to allow Taiwan to partake in the upcoming ICAO assembly.

RECOGNIZING WASHINGTON MATHEMATICS SCIENCE TECHNOLOGY PUBLIC CHARTER HIGH SCHOOL'S COMMITMENT TO STEM EDUCATION

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 2016

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to congratulate the students, parents, and faculty of Washington Mathematics Science Technology Public Charter High School for their commitment to science, technology, engineering, and mathematics enrichment, and for participating in my annual Science and Technology Braintrust.

The teachers at Washington Mathematics Science Technology Public Charter High School are committed to ensuring that our country's youth is exposed to a STEM curriculum, which is paramount to the future of our country. A prevalent theme amongst successful STEM professionals is the curiosity and drive instilled by their teachers at a young age. We must continue to invest in schools that highlight a STEM education, so that all students will have an opportunity to one day be an astrophysicist, doctor, engineer, or a geologist.

Mr. Speaker, Washington Mathematics Science Technology Public Charter High

School is a true advocate of STEM education and deserves recognition for its work. With great pride I can say that because of this school's commitment to STEM education, our country's youth is gaining the skills needed to compete in a rapidly globalizing world.

DR. LIN TAPPED AS ENTREPRENEUR OF THE YEAR IN TECHNOLOGY

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 2016

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Dr. Thompson Lin of Sugar Land, Texas for being named EY Entrepreneur of the Year in Technology for the Gulf Coast Area.

Dr. Lin is the Chairman of the Board, Founder, President and CEO of Applied Optoelectronics Inc., a leading provider in fiber-optics access network products for the internet datacenter, cable broadband, and the home market. With a Ph.D. in electrical engineering and founder of AOI, Dr. Lin has more than 10 U.S. patents and has authored over 200 technical papers and presentations. This award recognizes outstanding entrepreneurs who demonstrate excellence and extraordinary success in innovation, financial performance and commitment to their business and communities. We are lucky to have Dr. Lin's talent and dedication help our area remain at the forefront of job-creation, technology, and scientific discovery.

On behalf of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations and thank you to Dr. Thompson Lin for his innovation, dedication and work with AOI. Keep up the great work.

TRIBUTE TO JANELL AND REX BARBER

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 2016

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Janell and Rex Barber of Anita, Iowa on the very special occasion of their 60th wedding anniversary. They celebrated their anniversary on July 23, 2016.

Janell and Rex's lifelong commitment to each other and their family truly embodies Iowa values. As they reflect on their 60th anniversary, I hope it is filled with happy memories. May their commitment grow even stronger, as they continue to love, cherish, and honor one another for many years to come.

Mr. Speaker, I commend this great couple on their 60th year together and I wish them many more. I ask that my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives join me in congratulating them on this momentous occasion.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE FLORY QUARRY HOIST AND "SLATE QUARRY" HERITAGE MURAL DEDICATION

HON. MATT CARTWRIGHT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 2016

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to share a story of community spirit. On Saturday, September 17, an assembly of volunteers, coordinated by the Slate Belt Community Partnership and the Tots Gap Art Institute, dedicated the Flory Quarry Hoist and Slate Quarry heritage mural in downtown Bangor, Pennsylvania.

Industrial historian Mike Piersa spearheaded the initiative and donated the 28,500 pound, 116-year-old hoist. It was built by the S. Flory Manufacturing Company not far from where it is now installed in Bangor's Bethel Park. Until 1980, the hoist was in use at the Albion Quarry in Pen Argyl, PA. Powered by a steam engine, it routinely lifted 10,000-pound slate blocks. The Slate Belt region of Pennsylvania was a major producer of slate used for shingles, blackboards, and pencils.

The Slate Quarry mural features a day of work at a quarry. The Tots Gap Arts' Heritage Mural Education Program gives youth an active, creative role in community revitalization by promoting heritage and building community relationships and pride.

For these good works, I commend this group of volunteers for investing in their past to invigorate the vitality of their future.

RECOGNIZING THE BOROUGH OF MARYSVILLE UPON THE OCCASION OF ITS 150TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. LOU BARLETTA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 2016

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, it's my honor to recognize the Borough of Marysville, Pennsylvania, which is celebrating its 150th Anniversary this year.

Settled in 1755, it was incorporated as the Borough of Haley in 1866, and then reincorporated as the Borough of Marysville in 1867 by action of Governor Andrew Curtin. This historic town is located in the southern tip of Perry County within my district. The borough is noted for its small town feel where residents stay active in community events and know each other by name. Built on a hill with scenic views of the Susquehanna river, Marysville is well known for its smallmouth bass fishing and attracts fisherman from across the country. Local students attend Susquenita High School, which is named for the Susquehanna and Juniata Rivers that flow through the region.

Established as a railroad town hosting the Haley and Marysville Stations, the borough is home to the Rockville Bridge, which is the longest stone-arch railroad bridge in the world. Constructed with native sandstone from quarries in western Pennsylvania, the bridge's 48 arches were built by Italian stone masons and Irish laborers beginning in 1900 and finishing in 1902. The iconic bridge was named to the

National Register of Historic Places in 1975 and declared a National Historic Civil Engineering Landmark in 1979. The bridge is a constant reminder of how important railways were in making Pennsylvania an industrial giant, and the continued role they play in transporting our state's many goods and natural resources.

Mr. Speaker, for 150 years, the Borough of Marysville has been an important part of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, acting as a key railroad hub for goods to be shipped out across the state and country. I commend all its citizens that make this borough such a special place to live, and wish them the best in their future endeavors.

CONGRATULATIONS TO CHIN-YEE CHEW FOR BEING AWARDED THE FULBRIGHT SCHOLARSHIP

HON. BILLY LONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 2016

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Carl Junction, Missouri resident Chin-Yee Chew for being awarded the Fulbright Scholarship by the U.S. State Department.

The Fulbright Scholarship program was established by Congress in 1946 and signed into law by President Harry S. Truman. This scholarship was designed to build positive relationships with other countries while allowing recipients to live the day-to-day experiences of other countries. Chin-Yee Chew will join the already 370,000 past participants in this program.

This scholarship is a merit based scholarship that is highly competitive. Founded originally by Senator J. William Fulbright, this grant aims to have educational research and teachings extend beyond the United States.

Chin-Yee Chew, who attended Lyon College, will be an English Teaching Assistant and placed in Vietnam.

I am honored to recognize Chin-Yee Chew, and I congratulate her on receiving the Fulbright Scholarship.

HONORING THE LIFE OF STANLEY SHEINBAUM

HON. TED LIEU

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 2016

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to celebrate the life of Mr. Stanley Sheinbaum—father, husband, grandfather, reformer, philanthropist, and activist—who passed away on September 12, 2016, at the age of 96.

Born June 12, 1920 in New York, Stanley operated a sewing machine at his father's leather-goods store before the business collapsed during the Depression. He then joined the Army and served in World War II before graduating summa cum laude from Stanford with a degree in economics.

Michigan State hired Stanley to teach economics and the university quickly promoted him to coordinator of a program that provided technical assistance to South Vietnam. As a

peace activist, once he learned about the CIA's infiltration of this program, he resigned and became an outspoken critic of U.S. involvement in Vietnam. He joined the think tank, Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions and ran twice for Congress.

A passionate advocate for transparency in government, Stanley helped organize the Daniel Ellsberg Pentagon Papers defense team and served as the Chairman of the American Civil Liberties Union for nine years. He increased contributions and promoted major civil rights movements that created the public policy specialist position. From 1977 to 1989, Stanley was a University of California Regent where he successfully urged the University of California to divest from Apartheid South Africa.

Stanley also acted as a peace negotiator in the Middle East. He worked tirelessly to persuade Yasser Arafat and the Palestinian Liberation Organization to disavow terrorism and recognize Israel as a state.

Stanley reformed the Los Angeles Police Commission as president from 1991 to 1993 following the beating of Rodney King by police officers. His support for Willie L. Williams helped LAPD hire their first black police chief. Stanley's involvement as a human rights and peace activist in a range of issues will influence decades of political agenda.

He is survived by his wife of 52 years, Betty; brother; three stepchildren; eight grandchildren and twelve great-grandchildren.

I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the life of Stanley Sheinbaum.

TRIBUTE TO JOSH ARGANBRIGHT

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 2016

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Josh Arganbright as 2016 Panora Citizen of the Year.

A nomination letter from Josh's father, Dave Arganbright, describes why Josh is a perfect candidate for Citizen of the Year. "Over the years, this young man has demonstrated many times his commitment to the community and its youth. All of this is done to improve quality of life here without any pay or personal gain. He truly is an inspiration to fellow volunteers and the lives of the young."

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues in the United States Congress join me in commending Josh Arganbright for his service to Panora, Iowa and congratulate him on this award. I consider it an honor to represent him in the United States House of Representatives. I wish him nothing but the best in his future endeavors.

RECOGNIZING DREW FREEMAN MIDDLE SCHOOL'S COMMITMENT TO STEM EDUCATION

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 2016

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to congratulate the

students, parents, and faculty of Drew Freeman Middle School for their commitment to science, technology, engineering, and mathematics enrichment, and for participating in my annual Science and Technology Braintrust.

The teachers at Drew Freeman are committed to ensuring that our country's youth is exposed to a STEM curriculum, which is paramount to the future of our country. A prevalent theme amongst successful STEM professionals is the curiosity and drive instilled by their teachers at a young age. We must continue to invest in schools that highlight a STEM education, so that all students will have an opportunity to one day be an astrophysicist, doctor, engineer, or a geologist.

Mr. Speaker, Drew Freeman is a true advocate of STEM education and deserves recognition for its work. With great pride I can say that because of this school's commitment to STEM education, our country's youth is gaining the skills needed to compete in a rapidly globalizing world.

GABRIEL OLADIPO WINS NATIONAL CHAMPIONSHIP AT THE AAU JUNIOR OLYMPICS

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 2016

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Gabriel Oladipo of Missouri City, TX for winning the national championship in the discus at the Amateur Athletic Union (AAU) Junior Olympics.

Gabriel competed in two events at the Junior Olympics, the discus and shot put. His impressive throw of 192 feet, 6 inches in the discus earned him the esteemed national championship. In the shot put competition, Gabriel made Missouri City proud with his second place throw of 61 feet, .25 inches. Gabriel is a senior at Fort Bend's Hightower High School and competed in the discus in the 2015 International Association of Athletics Federations World Youth Championships.

On behalf of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations again to Gabriel Oladipo for winning the national championship in the discus at the AAU Junior Olympics. Keep up the great work.

TRIBUTE TO ARMA JO AND PAUL ALLEN

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 2016

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Arma Jo and Paul Allen of Council Bluffs, Iowa on the very special occasion of their 60th wedding anniversary. They celebrated their anniversary on July 21, 2016.

Arma Jo and Paul's lifelong commitment to each other and their family truly embodies Iowa values. As they reflect on their 60th anniversary, I hope it is filled with happy memories. May their commitment grow even stronger, as they continue to love, cherish, and honor one another for many years to come.

Mr. Speaker, I commend this great couple on their 60th year 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.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. TAMMY DUCKWORTH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 2016

Ms. DUCKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, on September 20, 2016, on Roll call number 521 on the motion to suspend the rules and pass, as amended, H.R. 670, Special Needs Trust Fairness and Medicaid Improvement Act, I am not recorded. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on the motion to suspend the rules and pass, as amended, H.R. 670.

On September 20, 2016, on Roll call number 522 on the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 5785, To amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for an annuity supplement for certain air traffic controllers, I am not recorded. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 5785.

On September 20, 2016, on Roll call number 523 on the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 5690, GAO Access and Oversight Act, I am not recorded. Had I been present, as an original cosponsor of the bipartisan GAO Access and Oversight Act, I would have voted YEA on the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 5690.

IN RECOGNITION OF DOMINIQUE
BEAUDRY AS A FULBRIGHT
AWARD RECIPIENT

HON. RICHARD HUDSON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 2016

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Ms. Dominique Beaudry for receiving a Fulbright award for the 2015–2016 academic year. Dominique was awarded a Fulbright English Teaching Assistant grant to Malaysia where she currently assists English teachers and serves as a cultural informant.

A native of Concord, North Carolina, Dominique graduated from Duke University in May of 2015 after studying public policy, education, and psychology. To go along with an outstanding academic career, Dominique has been an active leader in her community and demonstrated her willingness to serve others. Dominique's many commitments have now taken her across the globe as she continues to make an impact on the world around her.

Since its creation in 1946, the Fulbright Program has sought to foster people-to-people connections around the globe. By encouraging innovation and academic excellence, the program allows outstanding students to develop relationships, knowledge, and leadership skills necessary to address the challenges of the future. Alumni of the program have gone on to become leaders in their fields, and include Nobel Laureates, Pulitzer Prize winners, and even Members of Congress.

There is no doubt in my mind that Dominique is well on her way to joining the ranks of these impressive individuals. Her time in the Fulbright program will serve her well in all of her endeavors and will leave her with memories that she is sure to cherish for the rest of her life.

Mr. Speaker, please join me today in congratulating Ms. Dominique Beaudry as a Fulbright award recipient and wish her well as she continues to make a positive difference in the lives of others.

INTRODUCTION OF A RESOLUTION
COMMEMORATING THE INTER-
NATIONAL DAY OF PEACE

HON. JOHN LEWIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 2016

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer a resolution recognizing September 21st as the International Day of Peace.

This year marks the 35th anniversary of the United Nations declaring the need for the global community to celebrate an International Day of Peace. Around the world, today is an inclusive effort towards encouraging, promoting, and recommitting to peaceful action and ceasefire.

At a time when war, violence, and conflict dominate the news headlines, peace may seem a distant and lofty goal. However, during times like these I am reminded of a quote by Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.—“Mankind must evolve for all human conflict a method which rejects revenge, aggression, and retaliation. The foundation of such a method is love.” Mr. Speaker, I have witnessed seemingly insurmountable obstacles of hate being toppled by the spirit of love. It is for this reason that I continue to have faith in the possibility of positive and good change.

Every year, I fight tirelessly to protect the U.S. Institute of Peace (USIP), an organization which serves as the key link between U.S. national security agencies and their global counterparts to prevent and resolve conflicts. I believe in my heart of hearts that USIP's mission and work are critical to our national security and foreign policy priorities.

A few years ago, after leading a congressional delegation to India to commemorate the 50th Anniversary of Dr. and Mrs. King's pilgrimage, I introduced a bill—the Gandhi-King Scholarly Exchange Initiative Act. This bill teaches the doctrine of nonviolence, the effectiveness of applying the principle of Satyagraha, or non-violent resistance, to a new generation of emerging global leaders and scholars. USIP was on the same page and developed educational modules on non-violent civil mobilization.

In my core, I also believe that peace work begins at home. It is for this reason that I was so encouraged when the U.S. Institute of Peace launched the inaugural USIPeace Teachers program, which selected educators from across the country to incorporate peacebuilding into their curricula. My constituent, Timothy McMahon, a teacher at Atlanta International School, was an inaugural participant in this great program, and sought to instill the skill of effective, mindful dialogue in his classroom.

You see, Mr. Speaker, peacefulness begins at the local level, within each community, and in every person. Nearly a year ago, His Holiness, Pope Francis addressed the U.S. Congress, and he reminded us of the Golden Rule—“To treat others as we treat ourselves.” On days like today, I encourage each of my colleagues not only to cosponsor this resolution, but also to consider how even the smallest act can make this world a little better, a little more peaceful, a little more loving for generations yet unborn.

HONORING FORMER FLORESVILLE
MAYOR DIANA GARZA

HON. HENRY CUELLAR

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 2016

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the life of former Floresville Mayor Diana Garza.

Mrs. Garza was born January 17th 1956 to parents Cipriano Villarreal and Florinda Tejada Villarreal in Floresville, Texas. She graduated from Floresville High School where she met her soon to be husband Casimiro “Cassy” Garza. Eventually, they moved to Laredo, Texas where she worked for the Laredo Morning Times and then Rodriguez Pharmacy. They ultimately moved back to Floresville where she felt the calling to serve.

Diana was always dedicated to her community. She was a tireless worker and always considered the well-being of others before herself. Along with these qualities she always stood her ground and never wavered when trying to help those around her. These qualities led her to being elected to two terms as Floresville city's first female mayor and an active member of the local Chamber of Commerce, Rotary Club, and church.

It is the personal stories, however, that truly exemplify her character. If you were to ask those who knew her, you would surely hear how kind and warm she was. You would hear about her visits to the sick, the critical help she provided to Floresville after a terrible tornado, and the respect she always showed to those around her. I personally remember her hard work when we successfully obtained funding for the city's water treatment facilities. These were qualities that she was known for; everyday acts of kindness, appreciation, effort, and generosity.

Diana is survived by her husband, Casimiro, and their three children. Her legacy lives on in the work she did for her city, local community, friends, and family. She will also be remembered for the countless lives that she had touched and as an example of how we should live our lives.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to have the opportunity to recognize the life of Diana Garza.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF ENTREPRENEUR AND HUMANITARIAN, MR. EWING MARION KAUFFMAN

HON. EMANUEL CLEAVER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 2016

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor a community icon. On this, the 100th anniversary of one of the most influential business leaders Kansas City ever produced, it is my distinct honor to reflect on and remember my friend, universally known as Mr. K, for being the man, the entrepreneur and visionary citizen that he embodied.

One century ago today, Mr. Ewing Marion Kauffman was born in Garden City, Missouri. As a young boy, his family moved 45 minutes to Kansas City, where Mr. K would call home for the remainder of his life. Mr. K was a member of the Greatest Generation and served in the United States Navy during World War II. After returning home, he began working for a pharmaceutical company. However, the American Dream and an entrepreneurial spirit led him to start his own company in his basement, which he called Marion Labs.

That company, which began with only \$1,000 in net profits in the first year, grew over the next four decades into a \$1 Billion company, employing nearly 3,400 employees, before being bought by Merrell Dow in 1989. As a result of his business acumen, coupled with honesty and integrity in all his transactions, Mr. K was able to forge a business model that not only fueled Marion Labs to great success, but has since been replicated many times by local high-growth companies. Attesting to his entrepreneurial and innovative spirit, a recent study by the University of Bern in Switzerland that traced the “genealogy” of Kansas City’s technology companies, showed more than 20 existing local companies with direct ties to Marion Labs.

Marion Labs didn’t just inspire creation of new companies, but many of his former employees patterned their workplace culture on Mr. K’s model, built on a sense of trust and belonging that positively influenced performance. Mr. K lived by the philosophies of treat others like you want to be treated; share life’s rewards with those who make them possible; and give back to society. When the company was sold, more than 300 employees became millionaires. On a personal level, Mr. K regularly spoke to employees by addressing them by name, introducing them to others and personally hand writing thank you notes to employees.

During my time as a City Councilman and Mayor of Kansas City, I had the pleasure of getting to know Mr. K and his family. Many of my constituents think of Kauffman Stadium and the Kansas City Royals when you mention Mr. K. He brought the Royals to town in 1968 and his legacy of philanthropy and civic engagement can still be felt today. The Kauffman Foundation is perhaps the most enduring legacy, following the same vision that led Marion Labs to become what is known as a “Pillar Company” in the Kansas City community, by not only inspiring new entrepreneurial ventures, but also by training and investing in new businesses. Before his passing in 1993, Mr. Kauffman created a vibrant and

sustainable business future for the Kansas City region.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me today, on what would have been his 100th Birthday, to pause for a moment to honor one of our country’s greatest entrepreneurs, most generous philanthropists, and an innovative and compassionate leader in Mr. Ewing Marion Kauffman. Missouri’s Fifth District, our region, and country are better off today because of the life he led.

CELEBRATING THE SAN ANTONIO WINERY’S CENTENNIAL YEAR

HON. LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 2016

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to salute San Antonio Winery, the largest and longest-producing winery in Los Angeles, as it begins its centennial year celebration. Since its early days, it has been a beloved part of the Los Angeles community, providing a friendly meeting place for business leaders, families, and tourists alike. Not only is it a producing winery, it also boasts a large tasting room, restaurant, and banquet rooms, and offers daily tours and tastings.

The winery still operates its original location, a historical landmark in the heart of Los Angeles. While Los Angeles was once home to more than 90 wineries, this site stands as the last remaining vestige of the city’s viticultural history.

Over the past century, the winery has been owned and operated by four generations of the Riboli family, which originated in Bergamo, Italy. Three generations continue to work at the company, including head winemaker Anthony Riboli.

Through hard work, perseverance, and dedication to the community, the Riboli family has grown their business into one of the top thirty producing wineries in the country—and it continues to grow today. The family just celebrated the Grand Opening of a new state-of-the-art winery in Paso Robles, the Central Coast wine region where the majority of their estate vineyards are located, including 800 acres of prime vineyard land in Paso Robles, Monterey, and Napa Valley.

San Antonio Winery has received countless awards for its quality winemaking through the years. It currently produces seven different brands, including San Simeon, Maddalena (named for the winery’s matriarch), Opaque, Riboli Family Wines, and Stella Rosa, America’s number one imported Italian wine. The winery also just received a prestigious nomination from Wine Enthusiast Magazine for American Winery of the Year.

The Ribolis have other reasons to celebrate as well. The family just observed patriarch Stefano Riboli’s 95th birthday, and Maddalena will be turning 94 in December. Both remain cherished in their community and among their winery’s lifelong customers.

I hope my colleagues will join me in wishing long life to Stefano, Maddalena, and the magnificent winery they and their family have built into a Los Angeles institution.

MR. LAWRENCE CERVELLINO

HON. LEE M. ZELDIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 2016

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay a special tribute to Mr. Lawrence Cervellino, who passed away on December 7, 2015.

Lawrence was born on March 24, 1925. Larry, as he was known to his friends and family, had a fervent passion for life and his country. On the day Pearl Harbor was attacked, Larry went to his local recruiter’s office to sign up to serve his country, but was sent away because he was not old enough. Sure enough, on his 18th birthday, he enlisted in the Navy in 1943. He received his wings at Pensacola, Florida in 1946, and began serving in the Navy occupation of Saipan. He was recalled to active duty from October 3, 1952 to July 26, 1955 during the Korean War. During his time in the service, Larry was awarded numerous medals, including the American Defense, WWII Victory, Reserve Medal, Navy Occupation, and National Defense. In addition to his active duty status, Larry served as a reservist from 1949 to 1968 and retired from the Navy as a Lieutenant in 1968.

Larry would go on to graduate from Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute with a BS in Aeronautical Engineering in June 1955. That same year, Larry accepted a position with Grumman Aerospace Corporation as a Structural Flight Test Engineer, involving among other activities, Carrier Suitability Flight Tests at Patuxent River, Maryland. Larry stayed with Grumman until 1993, when he retired after four decades working to ensure the defense of our country. Throughout these years, Larry contributed to over thirty military organizations and was dedicated to helping veterans in any way that he could. He also served as Suffolk County Vice-Chair of the Long Island Coalition for Life and faithfully attended the annual March for Life in Washington, D.C. each year since its inception.

Larry enjoyed 47 years of marriage with his beautiful wife, Johanna Cisternino and is survived by his two children, Stacey Leigh Cervellino and Peter Lawrence Cervellino. Larry’s exemplary life of service was motivated and fueled by his love of God, family, and country. What he managed to accomplish during his lifetime and give back to the country cannot be summarized in a few words; however it is important we honor these types of individuals as best we can. It is my hope that many will follow in his footsteps and give back to our country as graciously as he did. People like him are a rare breed and they help make not only our country, but our world a much safer and better place.

TRIBUTE TO YOLANDA URBY URRABAZO

HON. HENRY CUELLAR

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 2016

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the life of one of Laredo’s finest teachers, Yolanda Urby Urrabazo.

Mrs. Urrabazo was born on February 12th 1947 to Juan and Carolina Urby in Del Rio, Texas. She was considered a miracle baby due to being born ten years after her nine siblings. Although her first language was Spanish, she quickly learned English and excelled in her studies. She received her bachelor's degree from Texas Women's University and then a master's degree in Spanish literature from The University of Texas-EI Paso. This enthusiasm for literature eventually led her to United High School in Laredo, Texas where she taught English literature for 32 years.

Yolanda's devotion to her students is shown by her long and passionate career in teaching. For over three decades she dedicated her life to educating generations of students. This commitment to education is an inspiration, and serves as a reminder for how important educators are. Her dedication to serving others will not be forgotten and will serve as a testament to what we should all strive for.

Mrs. Urrabazo is survived by her husband Ignacio, seven children, six grandchildren, and five siblings. Her legacy will live on in the countless people she helped shape. The mentoring and guidance that she provided will be shown throughout the community she touched. I have personally seen her impact through the great work her daughters Yolanda and Claudia provided when they worked in my office. It was clear through their hard work and ability that their mother had taught them very well. She serves as a reminder for how much one person can do to affect so many lives. The city of Laredo will miss her and cherish the kindness and care that she brought.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to have the opportunity to remember the legacy of Yolanda Urby Urrabazo.

served as the Chief Operating Officer of Progressive Transportation Service, Inc., a company that provided local and regional transportation services to communities throughout the state of New York.

In 1997, Joe was appointed Commissioner of the New York State Department of Transportation where he became the longest-serving Commissioner in the department's history. He also served as the Chairman of both the Transportation Research Board Executive Committee, and the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials' Standing Committee on Rail Transportation.

Prior to joining Amtrak, Joe was the Administrator of the Federal Railroad Administration and a member of the Amtrak Board of Directors. In November 2008, Joe was appointed President and CEO of Amtrak. Under his leadership and management, Amtrak greatly improved and expanded its operational and financial performance while providing a crucial service to the American people.

As President and CEO of Amtrak, Joe implemented a corporate strategy that resulted in record-setting ridership and revenue, as well as an expansion of customer services and infrastructure projects. He was instrumental in a major planning effort to develop a next-generation high-speed rail system, an extensive employee safety program, enhanced security initiatives, and improved maintenance of Amtrak's infrastructure. Joe was a visionary leader at a pivotal moment for Amtrak and for the country's railway system.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in honoring and commending Mr. Boardman for his unwavering dedication to public service and his contribution to our transportation infrastructure.

EDITORIAL BY MR. WADE
HENDERSON

HON. JOHN LEWIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 2016

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD an opinion editorial that appeared in the Washington Post on August 26, 2016.

This piece is authored by Mr. Wade Henderson, who serves as the president and chief executive of the Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, the national coalition of more than 200 organizations committed to a fair, open, and inclusive America:

THE PURSUIT OF CAPITAL PUNISHMENT FOR
DYLANN ROOF IS A STEP BACKWARD

(By Wade Henderson, August 26)

On Nov. 7 in Charleston, S.C., a federal court will begin selecting a jury in the death penalty prosecution of Dylann Roof, the accused killer of nine African American worshippers at the Emanuel African Methodist Episcopal Church. At first glance, the notion of a white man facing the death penalty for murdering black people in the South—in a killing inspired by the murderer's racist views—may seem like a marker of racial progress.

It isn't—and those who champion civil rights should not celebrate this moment. Roof's crime was surely heinous, and his racism was repugnant. But supporters of racial equality and equal treatment under the law should support Roof's offer to plead guilty and serve a sentence of life without the possibility of parole.

How can it be that a lifelong civil rights lawyer such as myself would take this position? Because the death penalty cannot be separated from the issue of racial discrimination, especially in the South. The history of slavery and lynching left deep scars in the black community, and the current death penalty does not fare much better. More than 8 in 10 of the executions carried out since the death penalty was reinstated in 1976 have occurred in the South. Blacks make up more than one-third of the 1,170 defendants executed in the region, with most convicted of murdering a white victim.

Given the racial disproportion inherent in the modern application of the death penalty, it is no surprise that most African Americans (including me) oppose the death penalty, a position that would also disqualify most of them (and me) from serving on the jury in Roof's case.

As a result, if the Roof trial continues on its present course, a jury will be chosen that represents only part of the community. Those who oppose the death penalty on principle will be struck from the pool of jurors by the presiding judge. Those who express doubts about the death penalty will likely be struck by the prosecution. The resulting jury will have fewer blacks, fewer women and fewer people of faiths that oppose the death penalty than a jury selected at random from the residents of Charleston. That cannot be a desirable outcome in such an emotional and racially charged case.

Neither would the adversarial proceeding necessitated by a refusal to accept Roof's offer to plead guilty and accept a sentence of life without the possibility of parole. Once the trial begins, there will be a detailed recounting of the worst day this community has ever experienced. It will be the prosecution's duty to portray this multiple murder as gruesomely as possible in order to secure a death sentence. Family members may be called to the stand to describe precisely what they went through that day and how it affected them.

Likewise, the defense will be obligated to do everything in its power to lessen Roof's culpability. This is how our adversarial process works, but it is not necessary here. Without the agony of trying to decide between life and death, a sentencing proceeding that followed a guilty plea could pay tribute to the victims, focusing on the value of their lives and the consequences of their loss. All family members could voice their pain, regardless of their view on the death penalty. It would not be an easy day, but far better than months of focusing only on Roof, followed by years of appeals and uncertainty.

Attorney General Loretta E. Lynch has allowed this case to proceed as a capital prosecution until now, but a new decision point is coming soon. Most criminal cases settle before trial because it is in the best interests of the entire community. That could happen here; the offer is already on the table. The attorney general need only agree.

After the racially inspired attack on the parishioners of Mother Emanuel, as the church is known, South Carolina took the bold and important step of permanently lowering the Confederate battle flag from the state capitol grounds. This powerful symbol—perceived by many as the embodiment of racism and discrimination—had to go.

With the death penalty, the Justice Department now has the power to lower another flag that has torn communities apart along racial lines. Capital punishment in this case may appear to be just retribution for Roof's unfathomable crime. Yet the real-life operation of the death penalty suggests that its application to Roof would only pave the way for future cases in which the death penalty is invoked to harm the very community on which he inflicted so much pain.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL
DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 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 \$19,524,335,895,543.03. We've added \$8,897,458,846,649.95 to our debt in 7 years. This is over \$8.8 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

HONORING JOSEPH BOARDMAN

HON. JEFF DENHAM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 2016

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, Congressman CAPUANO and I rise today to extend my sincerest appreciations to Joseph Boardman for his tireless effort and contribution to our nation's railroad system.

For over forty years, Joe has been actively involved in the transportation industry, working at the local, state, and federal level. Before starting his career in public service, Joe

RECOGNIZING THE LIFE AND
SERVICE OF TED RADKE

HON. MARK DeSAULNIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 2016

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the life and service of Ted Radke, longtime member of the Board of Directors for East Bay Regional Parks District.

Ted and I shared a passion for conservation. During his 36 year tenure on the East Bay Regional Parks District's board, Ted oversaw and was a key part of the Park District's expansion and growth. Specifically, Ted was instrumental in ensuring that the Park District's acreage more than doubled. After he partnered with former Representative George Miller, the Park District and I worked together to push for an increase in the size of the John Muir National Historic Site. Ted's commitment to the Park District is evident in that he was the longest-serving board member in its history.

In addition to his impressive stint on the Park District's board from 1978 until 2014, Ted was a former Martinez City Councilman and still holds the title as the youngest person ever elected to the Martinez Council, at age 24. Predictably, he used his time on the Council to fight for the conservation of Martinez's waterfront and further the fight for environmental protection. Ted also served on the board of the Association of Bay Area Governments.

Add to his public service a career at Contra Costa College, where Ted taught political science and history for 30 years, he also authored a book with his wife entitled "The People's Choice: An Owner's Guide to Direct Democracy and Political Participation in California," and was co-founder of Contra Costa Ecology Action and Eco-Info.

Ted was an inspiration and a friend. He passed away on August 28, 2016. His wife, Kathy, died in 2011, and he is survived by two sons and several grandchildren.

HONORING THE LIFE OF BETTY
JANE FRANCE

HON. RICHARD HUDSON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 2016

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of Mrs. Betty Jane

France, a lifelong philanthropist, who passed away on Monday, August 29, 2016. Our thoughts and prayers are with the entire France family as they mourn the loss of this extraordinary woman.

A native of Winston-Salem, North Carolina, Mrs. France dedicated her life to the service of others. As the founder and chairwoman emerita of the NASCAR Foundation, she helped lead efforts to grow the sport of NASCAR alongside her husband, the late NASCAR Chairman and CEO William C. France. Her positive attitude and uplifting demeanor was a source of inspiration for all of those around her.

Throughout her lifetime, Mrs. France was staunchly committed to bettering the lives of those around her, particularly the children in the community. A strong advocate in the field of children's health care, she launched projects that helped establish "Speediatrics" children's care units at two Florida hospitals. Her work in this field also included serving as an honorary co-chairperson for the Childress Institute for Pediatric Trauma, as well as on the boards of several other community service organizations. For her efforts, the NASCAR Foundation created the Betty Jane France Humanitarian Award which recognizes the outstanding charitable and volunteer efforts of NASCAR fans across the country.

Compassionate, kind, and loving, Mrs. France's impact resonated throughout the entire sport of NASCAR. Whether it was in her role as Chairwoman, as an advisor to her husband, or as a mother, her impact never went unnoticed. As someone who enabled others to explore the limitless possibilities of their dreams, she truly left the world a better place. While we mourn the loss of Mrs. France, there is no doubt in my mind that her legacy will live on through not only her professional success but also in the countless lives she was able to touch along the way.

Mr. Speaker, please join me today in commemorating the remarkable life of Mrs. Betty Jane France.

CONGRATULATING LINDA KAZEN
GARZA

HON. HENRY CUELLAR

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 2016

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Linda Kazen Garza on her new position as President of the Advocates for the

American Osteopathic Association; a national organization that supports and promotes the osteopathic profession through education, advocacy, and collaboration.

Linda Kazen Garza was born on December 1, 1963 to Antonio and Josie Kazen in Laredo, Texas. While growing up in Laredo she was a member of the Blessed Sacrament Church youth choir and a participant in the Junior Miss Laredo Pageant. Interestingly enough, it was during her time in choir that she met a fellow guitarist named David Garza, who later became her husband. After graduating from Nixon High School she went on to the University of Texas at Austin where she received her Bachelor of Science Degree in Communications.

Mrs. Garza's involvement with advocacy efforts within the osteopathic medical profession began during her husband's education at the Texas College of Osteopathic Medicine (TCOM) in Fort Worth. She would even go on to serve as the Vice President for TCOM's chapter of the Student Advocates Association. Eventually, she would go on to serve in her husband's medical practice as an office administrator. She has been serving alongside her husband for over two decades.

Linda's passion for the osteopathic medical field led her to become an active member of multiple advocacy groups. Her involvement includes: Treasurer and former President of the Advocates of the Texas Osteopathic Medical Association (ATOMA), Director at Large on the Board of Trustees and delegate to the Advocates for the American Osteopathic Association (AAOA), and she has been a member of several AAOA committees.

Linda Kazen Garza currently resides in Laredo, Texas where she is married to Dr. David Garza and has two sons named Joseph and Nicholas. In addition to her exemplary career and advocacy efforts; she's been an active member of her local community where she was a trustee for the Laredo Center for the Arts and former President of the Laredo Business and Professional Women's Association. In her free time she enjoys hunting, fishing, traveling, and going to the beach.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to have the opportunity to recognize Mrs. Linda Kazen Garza on her recent appointment and for her many years of service to the osteopathic community. It is pleasing to see this ninth generation Texan and Laredoan and niece of former Congressman Abraham Kazen doing great work for the community.

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, September 22, 2016 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

SEPTEMBER 27

- 10 a.m.
Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation
To hold an oversight hearing to examine the Federal Trade Commission. SR-253
- Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs
To hold hearings to examine fifteen years after 9/11, focusing on threats to the homeland. SD-342
- 2 p.m.
Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Subcommittee on Consumer Protection, Product Safety, Insurance, and Data Security
To hold an oversight hearing to examine the Federal Trade Commission, focus-

ing on perspectives from beyond the Commission.

SR-253

SEPTEMBER 28

- 10 a.m.
Committee on Foreign Relations
Subcommittee on East Asia, the Pacific, and International Cybersecurity Policy
To hold hearings to examine the persistent threat of North Korea and developing an effective United States response. SD-419
- Committee on the Judiciary
Subcommittee on Immigration and the National Interest
To hold an oversight hearing to examine the Administration's fiscal year 2017 refugee resettlement program. SD-226
- 2:15 p.m.
Committee on Foreign Relations
To hold hearings to examine the regional impact of the Syria conflict, focusing on Syria, Turkey, and Iraq. SD-419

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S5913–S5959

Measures Introduced: Fourteen bills were introduced, as follows: S. 3366–3379. **Pages S5956–57**

Measures Reported:

S. 2849, to ensure the Government Accountability Office has adequate access to information. (S. Rept. No. 114–356) **Page S5956**

Measures Considered:

Legislative Branch Appropriations Act—Agreement: Senate continued consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of H.R. 5325, making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2017.

Pages S5915–21, S5935–46

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill at 11 a.m., on Thursday, September 22, 2015; that notwithstanding the provisions of rule XXII, all post-cloture time on the motion to proceed to the bill expire at 11 a.m.; and that if the motion to proceed is agreed to, Senator McConnell be recognized to offer a substitute amendment. **Page S5959**

Foreign Military Sale: By 71 yeas to 27 nays (Vote No. 145), Senate tabled the motion to discharge the Foreign Relations Committee of S.J. Res. 39, relating to the disapproval of the proposed foreign military sale to the Government of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia of M1A1/A2 Abrams Tank structures and other major defense equipment. **Pages S5921–35**

Messages from the House **Pages S5955–56**

Measures Referred **Page S5956**

Executive Reports of Committees **Page S5956**

Additional Cosponsors **Pages S5957–58**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions

Additional Statements **Pages S5950–55**

Authorities for Committees to Meet **Pages S5958–59**

Privileges of the Floor **Page S5959**

Record Votes: One record vote was taken today. (Total—145) **Pages S5934–35**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 9:30 a.m. and adjourned at 6:31 p.m., until 9:30 a.m. on Thursday, September 22, 2016. (For Senate’s program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today’s Record on page S5959.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the Department of Agriculture and the current state of the farm economy, after receiving testimony from Thomas Vilsack, Secretary of Agriculture.

HOUSING VULNERABLE FAMILIES

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies concluded a hearing to examine the possible conversion of public housing and other project-based rental assistance to Section 8 vouchers, as well as administrative changes to the Section 8 voucher program, in order to improve the delivery of rental assistance to vulnerable families and individuals, after receiving testimony from Richard C. Gentry, San Diego Housing Commission, San Diego, California; Ed Olsen, University of Virginia, Charlottesville; and Erika C. Poethig, Urban Institute, Washington, D.C.

PRIORITIZING PUBLIC HEALTH

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies concluded a hearing to examine prioritizing public health, focusing on the Food and Drug Administration’s role in the generic drug marketplace, after receiving testimony from Janet Woodcock, Director, Center for Drug Evaluation and Research, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services.

AMERICA'S CASH PAYMENTS TO IRAN

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Subcommittee on National Security and International Trade and Finance concluded a hearing to examine terror financing risks of America's \$1.7 billion cash payments to Iran, including S. 2452, to prohibit the use of funds to make payments to Iran relating to the settlement of claims brought before the Iran-United States Claims Tribunal until Iran has paid certain compensatory damages awarded to United States persons by United States courts, after receiving testimony from Michael B. Mukasey, former Attorney General, Eric Edelman, Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments, and Suzanne Maloney, The Brookings Institution, all of Washington, D.C.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

S. 3346, to authorize the programs of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 3183, to prohibit the circumvention of control measures used by Internet ticket sellers to ensure equitable consumer access to tickets for any given event, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 3097, to establish the SelectUSA program, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

H.R. 4755, to inspire women to enter the aerospace field, including science, technology, engineering, and mathematics, through mentorship and outreach; and

H.R. 4742, to authorize the National Science Foundation to support entrepreneurial programs for women.

FWS MITIGATION POLICY OVERSIGHT

Committee on Environment and Public Works: Subcommittee on Fisheries, Water, and Wildlife con-

cluded an oversight hearing to examine the proposed revisions to the Fish and Wildlife Service mitigation policy, after receiving testimony from Michael J. Bean, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior; Jamison E. Colburn, Penn State University, University Park, Pennsylvania; Joshua Kindred, Alaska Oil and Gas Association, Anchorage; and Ryan Yates, National Endangered Species Act Reform Coalition, Washington, D.C.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Finance: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

An original bill entitled, "Miner's Protection Act of 2016"; and

An original bill entitled, "Retirement and Enhancement Savings Act of 2016".

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Indian Affairs: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

S. 2953, to promote patient-centered care and accountability at the Indian Health Service, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 3234, to amend the Native American Business Development, Trade Promotion, and Tourism Act of 2000, the Buy Indian Act, the Indian Trader Act, and the Native American Programs Act of 1974 to provide industry and economic development opportunities to Indian communities, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute; and

S. 3261, to establish a business incubators program within the Department of the Interior to promote economic development in Indian reservation communities.

INTELLIGENCE

Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee met in closed session to receive a briefing on certain intelligence matters from officials of the intelligence community.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 25 public bills, H.R.6091–6115; and 4 resolutions, H. Con. Res. 158–159; and H. Res. 880–881 were introduced.

Pages H5798–H5801

Additional Cosponsors:

Pages H5801–02

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

H.R. 5995, to strike the sunset on certain provisions relating to the authorized protest of a task or delivery order under section 4106 of title 41, United States Code (H. Rept. 114–779);

H.R. 2315, to limit the authority of States to tax certain income of employees for employment duties performed in other States (H. Rept. 114–780);

H. Res. 879, providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5931) to provide for the prohibition on cash payments to the Government of Iran, and for other purposes, and waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules (H. Rept. 114–781); and H.R. 5982, to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to provide for en bloc consideration in resolutions of disapproval for “midnight rules”, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 114–782, Part 1). **Page H5798**

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Ribble to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H5715**

Recess: The House recessed at 11:01 a.m. and reconvened at 12 noon. **Page H5721**

Guest Chaplain: The prayer was offered by the Guest Chaplain, Reverend Clarence A. Williams, Greater Mt. Zion African Methodist Episcopal Church, St. Petersburg, FL. **Page H5722**

Korean War Veterans Memorial Wall of Remembrance Act: The House agreed to take from the Speaker’s table and concur in the Senate amendment to H.R. 1475, to authorize a Wall of Remembrance as part of the Korean War Veterans Memorial and to allow certain private contributions to fund that Wall of Remembrance. **Page H5741**

Global Anti-Poaching Act: The House agreed to take from the Speaker’s table and concur in the Senate amendment to H.R. 2494, to support global anti-poaching efforts, strengthen the capacity of partner countries to counter wildlife trafficking, and designate major wildlife trafficking countries. **Pages H5741–43**

Condemning the Government of Iran’s state-sponsored persecution of its Baha’i minority and its continued violation of the International Covenants on Human Rights: The House agreed to discharge from committee and agree to H. Res. 220, as amended by Representative Royce, condemning the Government of Iran’s state-sponsored persecution of its Baha’i minority and its continued violation of the International Covenants on Human Rights. **Pages H5743–45**

GAO Civilian Task and Delivery Order Protest Authority Act of 2016: The House agreed to take from the Speaker’s table and pass H.R. 5995, to strike the sunset on certain provisions relating to the authorized protest of a task or delivery order under section 4106 of title 41, United States Code. **Page H5745**

Require Evaluation before Implementing Executive Wishlists Act: The House passed H.R. 3438, to amend title 5, United States Code, to postpone the effective date of high-impact rules pending judicial review, by a recorded vote of 244 ayes to 180 noes, Roll No. 535. **Pages H5755–64**

Rejected the Thompson (MS) motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on the Judiciary with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with an amendment, by a recorded vote of 182 ayes to 240 noes, Roll No. 534. **Pages H5762–63**

Pursuant to the Rule, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary now printed in the bill shall be considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule. **Page H5758**

Rejected:

Cicilline amendment (No. 1 printed in H. Rept. 114–777) that sought to exempt from the requirements of the legislation any rule that would reduce the cost of healthcare for people over the age of 65 (by a recorded vote of 189 ayes to 232 noes, Roll No. 532); and **Pages H5758–59, H5760–61**

DelBene amendment (No. 2 printed in H. Rept. 114–777) that sought to exempt from the bill’s requirements rules relating to improving the affordability of higher education (by a recorded vote of 184 ayes to 237 noes, Roll No. 533). **Pages H5759–60, H5761**

H. Res. 875, the rule providing for consideration of the bills (H.R. 3438) and (H.R. 5719) was agreed to by a recorded vote of 239 ayes to 181 noes, Roll No. 525, after the previous question was ordered by a yea-and-nay vote of 237 yeas to 171 nays, Roll No. 524. **Pages H5732–37**

Iranian Leadership Asset Transparency Act: The House passed H.R. 5461, to require the Secretary of the Treasury to submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees on the estimated total assets under direct or indirect control by certain senior Iranian leaders and other figures, by a yea-and-nay vote of 282 yeas to 143 nays, Roll No. 536. **Pages H5737–38, H5745–55, H5764**

Agreed to:

Poliquin manager’s amendment (No. 1 printed in H. Rept. 114–778) that adds Committee on Foreign Affairs to the reporting requirements in the bill; **Page H5753**

Young (IN) amendment (No. 2 printed in H. Rept. 114–778) that adds three additional provisions to the bill’s required report on Iranian leadership financial assets; and **Pages H5753–54**

Lance amendment (No. 3 printed in H. Rept. 114–778) that adds head of Atomic Energy Organization of Iran to list of Iranian leaders. **Pages H5754–55**

H. Res. 876, the rule providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5461) was agreed to by a recorded vote of 247 ayes to 174 noes, Roll No. 527, after the previous question was ordered by a yea-and-nay vote of 242 yeas to 181 nays, Roll No. 526.

Pages H5726–31, H5737–38

Suspensions—Proceedings Resumed: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measures which were debated on Tuesday, September 20th:

Emergency Citrus Disease Response Act of 2016: H.R. 3957, amended, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to temporarily allow expensing of certain costs of replanting citrus plants lost by reason of casualty, by a $\frac{2}{3}$ yea-and-nay vote of 400 yeas to 20 nays, Roll No. 528; Pages H5738–39

Expanding Seniors Receiving Dialysis Choice Act of 2016: H.R. 5659, amended, to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act with respect to expanding Medicare Advantage coverage for individuals with end-stage renal disease (ESRD), by a $\frac{2}{3}$ yea-and-nay vote of 423 yeas with none voting “nay”, Roll No. 529; Page H5739

Sustaining Healthcare Integrity and Fair Treatment Act of 2016: H.R. 5713, amended, to provide for the extension of certain long-term care hospital Medicare payment rules, clarify the application of rules on the calculation of hospital length of stay to certain moratorium-excepted long-term care hospitals, by a $\frac{2}{3}$ yea-and-nay vote of 420 yeas to 3 nays, Roll No. 530; Pages H5739–40

Providing for the extension of the enforcement instruction on supervision requirements for outpatient therapeutic services in critical access and small rural hospitals through 2016: H.R. 5613, amended, to provide for the extension of the enforcement instruction on supervision requirements for outpatient therapeutic services in critical access and small rural hospitals through 2016, by a $\frac{2}{3}$ yea-and-nay vote of 420 yeas with none voting “nay”, Roll No. 531; Pages H5740–41

Community Counterterrorism Preparedness Act: H.R. 5859, amended, to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish the major metropolitan area counterterrorism training and exercise grant program, by a $\frac{2}{3}$ yea-and-nay vote of 395 yeas to 30 nays, Roll No. 537; Pages H5764–65

Amending title 49, United States Code, to include consideration of certain impacts on commercial space launch and reentry activities in a navigable airspace analysis: H.R. 6007, to amend title 49, United States Code, to include consideration of certain impacts on commercial space launch and reentry activities in a navigable airspace analysis, by a

$\frac{2}{3}$ yea-and-nay vote of 425 yeas with none voting “nay”, Roll No. 538; Pages H5765–66

Directing the Secretary of Transportation to provide to the appropriate committees of Congress advance notice of certain announcements: H.R. 5977, to direct the Secretary of Transportation to provide to the appropriate committees of Congress advance notice of certain announcements, by a $\frac{2}{3}$ yea-and-nay vote of 424 yeas to 1 nay, Roll No. 539; Page H5766

Airport Construction and Alteration Reform Act of 2016: H.R. 6014, amended, to direct the Federal Aviation Administration to allow certain construction or alteration of structures by State departments of transportation without requiring an aeronautical study, by a $\frac{2}{3}$ yea-and-nay vote of 425 yeas with none voting “nay”, Roll No. 540; and Pages H5766–67

Agreed to amend the title so as to read: “To allow the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration to enter into reimbursable agreements for certain airport projects.”. Page H5767

Bathrooms Accessible in Every Situation (BABIES) Act: H.R. 5147, amended, to amend title 40, United States Code, to require that male and female restrooms in public buildings be equipped with baby changing facilities, by a $\frac{2}{3}$ yea-and-nay vote of 389 yeas to 34 nays, Roll No. 541; Pages H5767–68

Agreed to amend the title so as to read: “To amend title 40, United States Code, to require restrooms in public buildings to be equipped with baby changing facilities.”. Page H5768

Suspensions: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measures:

Mobile Workforce State Income Tax Simplification Act: H.R. 2315, to limit the authority of States to tax certain income of employees for employment duties performed in other States; Pages H5768–72

Protection of the Right of Tribes to stop the Export of Cultural and Traditional Patrimony Resolution: H. Con. Res. 122, amended, supporting efforts to stop the theft, illegal possession or sale, transfer, and export of tribal cultural items of American Indians, Alaska Natives, and Native Hawaiians in the United States and internationally; Pages H5772–74

Strengthening the Department of Homeland Security Secure Mail Initiative Act: H.R. 4712, amended, to direct the Secretary of Homeland Security to provide for an option under the Secure Mail Initiative under which a person to whom a document is sent under that initiative may require that

the United States Postal Service obtain a signature from that person in order to deliver the document;

Pages H5774–76

Improving Small Business Cyber Security Act of 2016: H.R. 5064, amended, to amend the Small Business Act to allow small business development centers to assist and advise small business concerns on relevant cyber security matters; **Pages H5776–79**

Stability and Democracy for Ukraine Act: H.R. 5094, amended, to contain, reverse, and deter Russian aggression in Ukraine, to assist Ukraine's democratic transition; and **Pages H5782–87**

Global Development Lab Act: H.R. 3924, amended, to establish in the United States Agency for International Development an entity to be known as the United States Global Development Lab.

Pages H5787–89

Nicaraguan Investment Conditionality Act (NICA) of 2016: The House agreed to discharge from committee and agree to H.R. 5708, as amended by Representative Royce, to oppose loans at international financial institutions for the Government of Nicaragua unless the Government of Nicaragua is taking effective steps to hold free, fair, and transparent elections. **Pages H5779–82**

Agreed to amend the title so as to read: "To oppose loans at international financial institutions for the Government of Nicaragua, other than to address basic human needs or promote democracy, unless the Government of Nicaragua is taking effective steps to hold free, fair, and transparent elections, and for other purposes." **Page H5782**

Senate Message: Message received from the Senate by the Clerk and subsequently presented to the House today appears on page H5726 ____.

Senate Referral: S. 3076 was referred to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. **Page H5798**

Quorum Calls—Votes: Twelve yea-and-nay votes and six recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H5735–36, H5736–37, H5737, H5737–38, H5738–39, H5739, H5739–40, H5740–41, H5760–61, H5761, H5763, H5763–64, H5764, H5764–65, H5765–66, H5766, H5767 and H5767–68. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 9:24 p.m.

Committee Meetings

FIFTEEN YEARS AFTER 9–11: THE STATE OF THE FIGHT AGAINST ISLAMIC TERRORISM

Committee on Armed Services: Full Committee held a hearing entitled "15 Years after 9–11: The State of the Fight Against Islamic Terrorism". Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

SEAPOWERS AND PROJECTION FORCES IN THE SOUTH CHINA SEA

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces held a hearing entitled "Seapower and Projection Forces in the South China Sea". Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

RESTORING THE TRUST FOR FAMILIES AND WORKING-AGE AMERICANS

Committee on the Budget: Full Committee held a hearing entitled "Restoring the Trust for Families and Working-Age Americans". Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

SUPPLANTING THE LAW AND LOCAL EDUCATION AUTHORITY THROUGH REGULATORY FIAT

Committee on Education and the Workforce: Subcommittee on Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education held a hearing entitled "Supplanting the Law and Local Education Authority Through Regulatory Fiat". Testimony was heard from Steve Canavero, Superintendent of Public Instruction, Nevada Department of Education; and public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Full Committee concluded a markup on H.R. 2566, the "Improving Rural Call Quality and Reliability Act of 2016"; H.R. 2669, the "Anti-Spoofing Act of 2016"; H.R. 1192, the "National Diabetes Clinical Care Commission Act"; H.R. 1209, the "Improving Access to Maternity Care Act"; H.R. 1877, the "Mental Health First Aid Act of 2015"; H.R. 2713, the "Title VIII Nursing Workforce Reauthorization Act of 2015"; H.R. 3537, the "Synthetic Drug Control Act of 2015"; and H.R. 4365, the "Protecting Patient Access to Emergency Medications Act of 2016". The following bills were ordered reported, as amended: H.R. 2669, H.R. 1209, H.R. 1877, H.R. 2713, H.R. 3537, and H.R. 4365. The following bills were ordered reported, without amendment: H.R. 2566 and H.R. 1192.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Select Investigative Panel of the Committee on Energy and Commerce held a business meeting to consider a report of the Select Investigative Panel of the Committee on Energy and Commerce recommending that the U.S. House of Representatives find StemExpress, LLC, and Catherine Spears Dyer, founder and Chief Executive Officer of StemExpress, LLC, in contempt of Congress for refusal to comply with subpoenas duly issued by the Select Investigative Panel of the Committee on Energy and Commerce. The report was approved, without amendment.

THE FUTURE OF HOUSING IN AMERICA: A BETTER WAY TO INCREASE EFFICIENCIES FOR HOUSING VOUCHERS AND CREATE UPWARD ECONOMIC MOBILITY

Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on Housing and Insurance held a hearing entitled “The Future of Housing in America: A Better Way to Increase Efficiencies for Housing Vouchers and Create Upward Economic Mobility”. Testimony was heard from Dominique Blom, Deputy Assistant Secretary, Office of Public Housing Investments, Department of Housing and Urban Development; and public witnesses.

CORPORATE GOVERNANCE: FOSTERING A SYSTEM THAT PROMOTES CAPITAL FORMATION AND MAXIMIZES SHAREHOLDER VALUE

Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on Capital Markets and Government Sponsored Enterprises held a hearing entitled “Corporate Governance: Fostering a System that Promotes Capital Formation and Maximizes Shareholder Value”. Testimony was heard from Anne Simpson, Investment Director, Sustainability, California Public Employees’ Retirement System; and public witnesses.

STOPPING THE NEXT ATTACK: HOW TO KEEP OUR CITY STREETS FROM BECOMING THE BATTLEGROUND

Committee on Homeland Security: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Stopping the Next Attack: How to Keep Our City Streets from Becoming the Battleground”. Testimony was heard from John Miller, Deputy Commissioner, Intelligence and Counterterrorism, New York City Police Department; Sheriff Jerry L. Demings, Orange County Sheriff’s Office, Orange County, Florida; and public witnesses.

IMPEACHMENT ARTICLES REFERRED ON JOHN KOSKINEN, PART III

Committee on the Judiciary: Full Committee held a hearing on the Impeachment Articles Referred on

John Koskinen, Part III. Testimony was heard from John Koskinen, Commissioner, Internal Revenue Service.

THE IMPACTS OF THE OBAMA CEQ’S FINAL GUIDANCE FOR GHG EMISSIONS AND THE EFFECTS OF CLIMATE CHANGE

Committee on Natural Resources: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “The Impacts of the Obama CEQ’s Final Guidance for GHG Emissions and the Effects of Climate Change”. Testimony was heard from Christy Goldfuss, Managing Director, Council on Environmental Quality.

THE STATUS OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT’S MANAGEMENT OF WOLVES

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations held a hearing entitled “The Status of the Federal Government’s Management of Wolves”. Testimony was heard from Steve Guertin, Deputy Director of Policy, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior; Virgil Moore, Director, Idaho Department of Fish and Game, State of Idaho; Gordon Myers, Director, North Carolina Wildlife Resources Commission, State of North Carolina; Alexandra Sandoval, Director, New Mexico Department of Game and Fish, State of New Mexico; and public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Natural Resources: Full Committee began a markup on H.R. 564, “Endangered Salmon and Fisheries Predation Prevention Act”; H.R. 2387, the “Alaska Native Veterans Land Allotment Equity Act”; H.R. 5780, the “Utah Public Lands Initiative Act”; H.R. 5984, the “Pechanga Band of Luiseno Mission Indians Water Rights Settlement Act”; and S. 3028, the “Daniel J. Evans Olympic National Park Wilderness Act”.

REVIEWING THE RISING PRICE OF EPIPENS

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Reviewing the Rising Price of EpiPens”. Testimony was heard from Doug Throckmorton, Deputy Director, Center for Drug Evaluation and Research, Food and Drug Administration; and a public witness.

PROHIBITING FUTURE RANSOM PAYMENTS TO IRAN ACT

Committee on Rules: Full Committee held a hearing on H.R. 5931, the “Prohibiting Future Ransom Payments to Iran Act”. The committee granted, by record vote of 8–3, a structured rule for H.R. 5931. The rule provides one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority

member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. 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 114–64 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. Additionally, the rule waives clause 6(a) of rule XIII (requiring a two-thirds vote to consider a rule on the same day it is reported from the Rules Committee) against any resolution reported through the legislative day of September 27, 2016, relating to a measure making or continuing appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2017. Testimony was heard from Chairman Royce and Representative Engel.

EXAMINING MISCONDUCT AND INTIMIDATION OF SCIENTISTS BY SENIOR DOE OFFICIALS

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Subcommittee on Oversight; and Subcommittee on Energy, held a joint hearing entitled “Examining Misconduct and Intimidation of Scientists by Senior DOE Officials”. Testimony was heard from Sharlene Weatherwax, Associate Director, Biological and Environmental Research, Department of Energy; and Noelle Metting, Radiation Biologist, Department of Energy.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 6076, the “To Research, Evaluate, Assess, and Treat Astronauts Act”; H.R. 6066, the “Cybersecurity Responsibility and Accountability Act of 2016”; and H.R. 5829, the “ADVISE Now Act”. The following bills were ordered reported, without amendment: H.R. 6066 and H.R. 5829. H.R. 6076 was ordered reported, as amended.

AN EXAMINATION OF FEMA’S LIMITED ROLE IN LOCAL LAND USE DEVELOPMENT DECISIONS

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “An Examination of FEMA’s Limited Role in Local Land Use Development Decisions”. Testimony was heard from Michael Grimm, Assistant Administrator for Mitigation, Federal Emergency Management Agency; Chris Shirley, Natural Hazards and Floodplain Specialist, Department of Land Conservation and Development, State of Oregon; Denny Doyle, Mayor, City of Beaverton, Oregon; and public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Veterans’ Affairs: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 5047, the “Protecting Veterans’ Educational Choice Act of 2016”; H.R. 5428, the “Military Residency Choice Act”; H.R. 4757, to amend title 38, United States Code, to expand the eligibility for headstones, markers, and medallions furnished by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs for deceased individuals who were awarded the Medal of Honor and are buried in private cemeteries; H.R. 5166, the “WINGMAN Act”; H.R. 3216, the “VET Act”; H.R. 4150, the “Department of Veterans Affairs Emergency Medical Staffing Recruitment and Retention Act”; H.R. 5099, to establish a pilot program on partnership agreements to construct new facilities for the Department of Veterans Affairs; H.R. 5162, the “Vet Connect Act of 2016”; H.R. 5392, the “No Veterans Crisis Line Call Should Go Unanswered Act”; H.R. 5399, the “Ethical Patient Care for Veterans Act of 2016”; and H.R. 5600, the “No Hero Left Untreated Act”. The following bills were ordered reported, as amended: H.R. 4757, H.R. 5166, H.R. 4150, H.R. 5099, and H.R. 5600. The following bills were ordered reported, without amendment: H.R. 5047, H.R. 5428, H.R. 3216, H.R. 5162, H.R. 5392, and H.R. 5399.

UNDERSTANDING SOCIAL SECURITY’S SOLVENCY CHALLENGE

Committee on Ways and Means: Subcommittee on Social Security held a hearing entitled “Understanding Social Security’s Solvency Challenge”. Testimony was heard from Stephen C. Goss, Chief Actuary, Social Security Administration; and Keith Hall, Director, Congressional Budget Office.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Ways and Means: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 5879, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the credit for production from advanced nuclear power facilities; H.R. 5406, the “Helping Ensure Accountability, Leadership, and Trust in Tribal Healthcare Act”; H.R.

5204, the “Stop Taxing Death and Disability Act”; and H.R. 4220, the “Water and Agriculture Tax Reform Act of 2015”. The following bills were ordered reported, as amended: H.R. 5879, H.R. 5406, H.R. 5204, and H.R. 4220.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 22, 2016

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Armed Services: to hold hearings to examine United States national security challenges and ongoing military operations, 9:30 a.m., SD–G50.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Subcommittee on Housing, Transportation, and Community Development, to hold an oversight hearing to examine the Department of Housing and Urban Development inspection process, 10 a.m., SD–538.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: to hold hearings to examine S. 346, to withdraw certain land located in Curry County and Josephine County, Oregon, from all forms of entry, appropriation, or disposal under the public land laws, location, entry, and patent under the mining laws, and operation under the mineral leasing and geothermal leasing laws, S. 437, to provide for congressional approval of national monuments and restrictions on the use of national monuments, to establish requirements for the declaration of marine national monuments, S. 1416, to amend title 54, United States Code, to limit the authority to reserve water rights in designating a national monument, S. 2056, to provide for the establishment of the National Volcano Early Warning and Monitoring System, S. 2380, to require the Secretary of the Interior to establish a pilot program for commercial recreation concessions on certain land managed by the Bureau of Land Management, S. 2681, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to retire coal preference right lease applications for which the Secretary has made an affirmative commercial quantities determination, to substitute certain land selections of the Navajo Nation, to designate certain wilderness areas, S. 2991, to withdraw certain land in Okanogan County, Washington, to protect the land, S. 3049, to designate the Organ Mountains and other public land as components of the National Wilderness Preservation System in the State of New Mexico, S. 3102, to promote conservation, improve public land management, and provide for sensible development in Pershing County, Nevada, S. 3167, to establish the Appalachian Forest National Heritage Area, S. 3192, to designate a mountain peak in the State of Montana as “Alex Diekmann Peak”, S. 3203, to provide for economic development and access to resources in Alaska, S. 3204, to provide for the exchange of Federal land and non-Federal land in the State of Alaska for the construction of a road between King Cove and Cold Bay, S. 3254, to provide for a land ex-

change involving certain National Forest System land in the State of South Dakota, S. 3273, to make technical corrections to the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act, S. 3312, to extend the authorization of the Uranium Mill Tailings Radiation Control Act of 1978 relating to the disposal site in Mesa County, Colorado, S. 3315, to authorize the modification or augmentation of the Second Division Memorial, S. 3316, to maximize land management efficiencies, promote land conservation, generate education funding, S. 3317, to prohibit the further extension or establishment of national monuments in the State of Utah except by express authorization of Congress, H.R. 1838, to establish the Clear Creek National Recreation Area in San Benito and Fresno Counties, California, to designate the Joaquin Rocks Wilderness in such counties, and H.R. 2009, 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, 9:30 a.m., SD–366.

Committee on Foreign Relations: business meeting to consider the nominations of Christopher Coons, of Delaware, and Ronald H. Johnson, of Wisconsin, both to be a Representative of the United States of America to the Seventy-first Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, and Sung Y. Kim, of California, to be Ambassador to the Republic of the Philippines, Rena Bitter, of Texas, to be Ambassador to the Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Kamala Shirin Lakhdir, of Connecticut, to be Ambassador to Malaysia, and a routine list in the Foreign Service, all of the Department of State, Time to be announced, S–216, Capitol.

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: to hold hearings to examine exploring current practices in cosmetic development and safety, 10 a.m., SD–430.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: to hold hearings to examine exploring a right to try for terminally ill patients, 10 a.m., SD–342.

Subcommittee on Regulatory Affairs and Federal Management, to hold hearings to examine agency regulatory guidance, 3 p.m., SD–342.

Select Committee on Intelligence: to receive a closed briefing on certain intelligence matters, 2 p.m., SH–219.

House

Committee on Agriculture, Subcommittee on Conservation and Forestry, hearing entitled “Rehabilitation of the Chesapeake Bay: Healing in the Bay the Voluntary Way”, 10 a.m., 1300 Longworth.

Committee on Education and the Workforce, Subcommittee on Health, Employment, Labor, and Pensions, hearing entitled “Discussion Draft to Modernize Multiemployer Pensions”, 9:30 a.m., 2175 Rayburn.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, Subcommittee on Commerce, Manufacturing, and Trade; and Subcommittee on Energy and Power, joint hearing entitled “Midterm Review and Update on the Corporate Average Fuel Economy Program and Greenhouse Gas Emissions Standards for Motor Vehicles”, 10 a.m., HVC–210.

Subcommittee on Communications and Technology, hearing entitled “Modernizing the Telephone Consumer Protection Act”, 11 a.m., 2322 Rayburn.

Committee on Financial Services, Full Committee, hearing entitled “The Annual Report of the Financial Stability Oversight Council”, 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Capital Markets and Government Sponsored Enterprises, hearing entitled “Examining the Agenda of Regulators, SROs, and Standards-Setters for Accounting, Auditing, and Municipal Securities”, 2 p.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific, hearing entitled “Diplomacy and Security in the South China Sea: After the Tribunal”, 2 p.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations, markup on H.R. 2189, the “Walter Patterson and Werner Foerster Justice and Extradition Act”; and H.R. 3833, to require a regional strategy to address the threat posed by Boko Haram, 2 p.m., 2200 Rayburn.

Committee on Homeland Security, Subcommittee on Oversight and Management Efficiency, hearing entitled “Identifying the Enemy: Radical Islamist Terror”, 10 a.m., 311 Cannon.

Committee on the Judiciary, Full Committee, hearing entitled “Oversight of United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement”, 10 a.m., 2237 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Regulatory Reform, Commercial and Antitrust Law, hearing entitled “Treating the Opioid Epidemic: The State of Competition in the Markets for Addiction Medicine”, 2 p.m., 2237 Rayburn.

Committee on Natural Resources, Full Committee, markup on H.R. 564, “Endangered Salmon and Fisheries Predation Prevention Act”; H.R. 2387, the “Alaska Native Veterans Land Allotment Equity Act”; H.R. 5780, the

“Utah Public Lands Initiative Act”; H.R. 5984, the “Pechanga Band of Luiseno Mission Indians Water Rights Settlement Act”; and S. 3028, the “Daniel J. Evans Olympic National Park Wilderness Act” (continued), 10 a.m., 1334 Longworth.

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Full Committee, hearing entitled “Examining Preservation of State Department Federal Records” (continued); and possible business meeting to consider a resolution and report recommending that the House of Representatives find Bryan Pagliano in Contempt of Congress for Refusal to Comply with a Subpoena Duly Issued by the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, in the event that the witness fails to appear at the hearing, 10 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Full Committee, hearing entitled “Examining Misconduct and Mismanagement at the National Park Service”, 1 p.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Information Technology, hearing entitled “Closing the Talent Gap in Federal IT”, 3 p.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Government Operations, hearing entitled “Examining Billion Dollar Waste through Improper Payments”, 3 p.m., 2247 Rayburn.

Joint Meetings

Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe: to hold hearings to examine atrocities in Iraq and Syria, focusing on relief for survivors and accountability for perpetrators, 10 a.m., 2200, Rayburn Building.

Full Committee, to receive a briefing on Moldova at a crossroads, 4 p.m., 2456, Rayburn Building.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

9:30 a.m., Thursday, September 22

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10 a.m., Thursday, September 22

Senate Chamber

Program for Thursday: After the transaction of any morning business (not to extend beyond 11 a.m.), Senate will continue consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of H.R. 5325, Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, post-cloture.

House Chamber

Program for Thursday: Complete consideration of H.R. 5719—Empowering Employees through Stock Ownership Act. Consideration of measures under suspension of the rules.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Barletta, Lou, Pa., E1329
 Bishop, Mike, Mich., E1328
 Buck, Ken, Colo., E1327
 Butterfield, G.K., N.C., E1325
 Cartwright, Matt, Pa., E1322, E1329
 Cleaver, Emanuel, Mo., E1331
 Coffman, Mike, Colo., E1333
 Courtney, Joe, Conn., E1322
 Cuellar, Henry, Tex., E1331, E1332, E1334
 DeSaulnier, Mark, Calif., E1333
 Denham, Jeff, Calif., E1333
 DesJarlais, Scott, Tenn., E1320
 Duckworth, Tammy, Ill., E1331
 Eshoo, Anna G., Calif., E1319

Fitzpatrick, Michael G., Pa., E1326
 Foster, Bill, Ill., E1328
 Garrett, Scott, N.J., E1319
 Gutiérrez, Luis V., Ill., E1321
 Hudson, Richard, N.C., E1331, E1334
 Johnson, Eddie Bernice, Tex., E1321, E1323, E1326, E1327, E1329, E1330
 King, Steve, Iowa, E1324
 Lewis, John, Ga., E1331, E1333
 Lieu, Ted, Calif., E1330
 LoBiondo, Frank A., N.J., E1319
 Long, Billy, Mo., E1322, E1324, E1328, E1330
 Matsui, Doris O., Calif., E1324
 McDermott, Jim, Wash., E1319, E1321, 1325
 Messer, Luke, Ind., E1326
 Miller, Jeff, Fla., E1320

Mulvany, Mick, S.C., E1328
 Olson, Pete, Tex., E1321, E1323, E1324, E1327, E1329, E1330
 Pallone, Frank, Jr., N.J., E1322, E1328
 Paulsen, Erik, Minn., E1323
 Rogers, Harold, Ky., E1319
 Rogers, Mike, Ala., E1325
 Rokita, Todd, Ind., E1320, E1327
 Roybal-Allard, Lucille, Calif., E1332
 Walberg, Tim, Mich., E1324
 Yoder, Kevin, Kans., E1323
 Young, David, Iowa, E1321, E1322, E1323, E1325, E1326, E1327, E1328, E1329, E1330, E1330
 Zeldin, Lee M., N.Y., E1332



Congressional Record

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.