

in an informal setting to sit at the table of brotherhood and to get to know each other in such a way as to not only develop a relationship but as to develop a friendship. The AJC is a supporter of relationship building, but, more importantly, of establishing relationships that can lead to friendships.

So I am honored today, Mr. Speaker, to present H. Res. 518, a resolution to help us acknowledge the great work of the AJC, not only this year, but in each year to come, such that this House of Representatives will annually record and recognize the accomplishments of the AJC and its members.

I mentioned SANDER LEVIN, who is from Michigan. I may have said “Minnesota” earlier. I want to correct the RECORD. He is a dear friend and a great supporter of this resolution, and he is also a person who has been in the fight for human rights. That means human rights as they relate to all people, not just to some people.

I am honored to close with a very brief word about the AJC and what I see in the future.

I believe that the AJC, given its history, is going to help us write a future that will bring peace to Israel and its neighbors. I believe that the AJC has demonstrated that it not only wants to be of benefit to Israel, but also to its neighbors. I believe that, with its involvement here and in Israel, the AJC is going to make a difference.

I think that the AJC, because of its history, will help us through this immigration reform debate. The AJC does a lot of research, and it has a lot of intelligence on how this type of circumstance, with people living in the shadows, can impact the lives of people beyond their physical existence and also beyond their mental existence. I am proud that the AJC is providing this type of intelligence.

I believe that the AJC, in the future, will help us with issues related to police community relations. The AJC is always available to help us when we have these turbulent times, when there are circumstances that must be addressed by communities that are grieving. The AJC helps us to bring the communities together so that we can, at some point, come to a conclusion that is beneficial to the community as a whole and to the persons who have been injured or harmed.

In the future, I believe, as the AJC moves forward with its various programs, it will help us with the hopes and with the aspirations of people who are suffering in places around the world from various natural disasters. I think they will do even more to help persons who are suffering from natural disasters. They have done an awful lot in every circumstance that is mentionable to date, but I do think that they will do even more. They have a wide reach, and they make sure that they are present, in some way, in order to be of assistance.

The AJC has been there. My prediction is that it will be there and that

it will make a difference when it is present. I am honored to have received this time, and I do trust that Members who have statements will place them in the RECORD.

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

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as a proud original cosponsor of House Resolution 518, Honoring and Praising the American Jewish Committee on the Occasion of its 109th anniversary, and to more broadly commend and celebrate the work of AJC. Thank you to my colleague Representative AL GREEN for organizing this special order hour.

Originally founded to raise awareness about the targeting of Jewish communities in Russia, AJC has become a leading voice and advocate against racism and prejudice here in the United States and around the world. Rooted in the Jewish values of *tikkun olam*—repairing the world—and of being a voice for those who cannot speak for themselves, AJC has been a key actor in pivotal movements and legislative victories including the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Voting Rights Act, and for comprehensive immigration reform. As we continue to work to fulfill the complete visions of those movements, AJC will continue to be on the front lines.

AJC has partnered with governments all over the world to promote tolerance and understanding and successfully worked to restore and preserve Jewish historical and cultural centers from India to Morocco to Argentina. This work is critical not only for supporting Jewish communities and historical memory abroad, but also for the broader goal of promoting intercultural and interreligious understanding in the face of hatred and violence.

On a more personal level, as a young legislator in the Florida House, the American Jewish Committee took me on my first trip to Israel in 1995. That mission was nothing short of transformative. Although I felt a connection to the land of Israel as a Jew, that trip was the first of many that has deepened my connection to the land, to the history and reinforcing my steadfast commitment to supporting the state of Israel and the U.S.-Israel relationship. With threats coming from across and within her borders, our support for this relationship has perhaps never been more important.

So again, I commend the American Jewish Committee for its work on behalf of the Jewish community, on behalf of Israel, and on behalf of all the people its work impacts.

#### LIFTING THE CRUDE OIL EXPORT BAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HILL). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER) for 30 minutes.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk a little bit about one component of the omnibus tax extender package that is dominating the legislative agenda as we wrap up this year.

The one piece of the package that I want to talk about is the lifting of the crude oil export ban, which is an issue that has passed twice now in the House of Representatives—in fact, as a stand-alone bill. H.R. 702, the lifting of the

crude oil export ban, passed with 62 percent of the vote.

As is often the case, good bills that are passed by the House often languish in the Senate for a number of reasons. Perhaps one of the main reasons bills languish in the Senate is that their rules are as antiquated as is this export ban on crude oil.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take some time to talk about this provision and why it is important that we lift the crude oil export ban. I want to talk a little bit about the history that led to the export ban in the first place, and I want to talk about a more optimistic future as we look at the oil renaissance—what it has created and what it can create.

As I said, the export ban really is an antiquated law. It was put in place 42 years ago, which was a very different time in our country. It was different for a number of reasons, not the least of which being that the ban on exporting crude oil came at a time when our country did not enjoy energy abundance as we do today. It, rather, suffered from a scarcity of energy resources—a scarcity of oil, a scarcity of all kinds of energy—and, certainly, from a scarcity of the products that are created by oil. It suffered even from a scarcity, frankly, of some of the technologies that make the development of fossil fuels and, yes, of new, cleaner—greener, if you will—energy sources.

We are nothing in this country but for our innovation. I think innovation is the key to much of our success. It is not that the United States really had a scarcity of resources, but that, rather, we had a scarcity of technology to develop those resources. As the technology developed to get more and more of our energy resources and to develop them, it also progressed to make it more and more efficient to develop them and to make it cleaner to develop them. I am happy to elaborate.

I represent the great State of North Dakota. I am the only Member of the people's House from the State of North Dakota. We have just over 700,000 people in my State. So, like my 434 colleagues, I represent, roughly, 700,000 citizens. It just so happens that they make up a State.

In just the past few years alone, we have lost 80,000 U.S. jobs, just in the last year, 80,000 U.S. jobs, because our oil producers have been forced to scale back their rigs by nearly 60 percent. That is the result of a collapse in price.

Why is there a collapse in price? There is a collapse in price largely because we are producing a lot more, and, of course, we cannot sell the product outside of the United States. Obviously, you can't produce more than your consumers can take in.

In North Dakota, we grow a lot of crops. We grow a lot of food to feed a hungry world. In fact, we are the number one producer of anywhere from 12 to 16 or 18 crops depending on the year. We produce a lot of wheat, but we can't begin to eat it all. We produce a lot of

cattle. We produce a lot of honey. We produce a lot of sunflowers. We produce a lot of beans. We produce a lot of products that we couldn't begin to consume in this country, but there are hungry people all over the world who would love to consume it.

So we are always innovating, creating new breeds and technologies and farming practices and chemicals and, yes, modifying the product. Why? It is because there is not more land on which to grow more food, but there are many more people who need to eat it throughout the world.

The same is true, in many respects, of energy. Yet now, as we have come upon this time with this renaissance that was created—again, not because God suddenly put more oil under the ground, but because of technology—the advancement of horizontal drilling and hydraulic fracturing has unlocked billions of barrels of oil that were always there or were at least there for several years—decades, centuries, millennia. It has unlocked it because of technology.

We talk a lot about energy independence and about the goal to get there. Yes, that is a noble goal. I would submit, though, that more important than that is energy security. And I have heard the Chair, Mr. Speaker, talk about the topic of energy security with great eloquence. Energy security is like food security. It is the ability to develop and to produce what you need as well as to produce for the global marketplace, increasing our influence in the world. I am going to get into that in a little bit.

Let's not forget about the jobs. Let me talk for a minute about the jobs in my home State of North Dakota, which is now the second leading producing State of oil, second only to Texas.

I was an economic development director for our State at a time when we were beginning to diversify our economy, at a time when out-migration was just starting to plateau. Since that time, we have become the fastest growing economy in the country and have the fastest growing population in the country. We now have the second highest per capita personal income in the country and the lowest unemployment rate in the country. In fact, we still, even with this downturn, have more jobs than we have people looking for work in North Dakota.

I have seen people go from poverty to prosperity. There is nothing wrong with that. I have seen truck drivers become fleet owners. I have seen short order cooks become restaurateurs. I have seen carpenters become developers.

□ 1645

I have seen people who have a water well become entrepreneurs selling water for hydraulic fracturing.

I have seen the renaissance lift people up. While a rising tide lifts all boats, they don't necessarily all get lifted at the exact same time. So there is a little bit of massaging and inter-

vention that goes on to help people even during the boom, if you will, to keep up.

According to an IHS Energy study, for every one job created in the oil and gas sector, there are six jobs created in the broader economy. I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, from my experience in North Dakota, that is definitely true. It is not just the oil rig worker. It is not just the truck driver. It is not just the pipeline worker.

All of them, as important as they are and as good of jobs as they are, it is that restaurant owner. It is the hair dresser. It is the Main Street retailer, the person selling groceries. It is the entrepreneur who comes up with an idea no one else had thought of before. It is the entrepreneur that sees the problem that needs a fix, finds the fix, sells it and markets it and becomes an employer as well, rather than just an employee.

By the way, the American jobs created by the oil renaissance of recent years exists in all 50 States.

Speaker RYAN put out this chart today, this little graphic piece, identifying the opportunities that lifting the crude oil export ban would have that go beyond the renaissance that we have experienced in recent years. Lifting the oil export ban would create an estimated 1 million American jobs in nearly all 50 States. That is because the supply chain that it takes to produce the oil, to discover the oil, to move the oil, to refine the oil, to finance, to do the accounting, it is in every State.

In fact, the President's home State of Illinois is one of the greatest beneficiaries of the oil renaissance. Many of these 1 million jobs would be created right there within a matter of years. It would add, imagine now, \$170 billion—with a B—to our gross domestic product every year.

At a time when we are looking for revenue to meet the priorities of our Nation, at a time while unemployment has come down, we still have a very, very low workforce participation rate, at a time when our education system doesn't always match the opportunities, we have the opportunity with these additional dollars and the additional job opportunities to meet the demands of a growing economy. All the while, we could, with lifting the crude oil export ban, meet the market demands around the world.

Mr. Speaker, I happen to think that history can be a great teacher. I said earlier that I want to address the history or the context of this export ban. How did this come to be?

You know, as I said, much has been written and said by me and my colleagues and others in the industry how lifting the export ban would be good for our economy, how it would be good for job creation, and how it would be good for the United States of America. The history of how it came to be, I think, is useful.

It was the Yom Kippur war in 1972 led by Syria—an attack by Syria backed

up by, Mr. Speaker, none other than the Soviet Union—against our friends, Israel. It was the United States, as has been the rich tradition of our country, who came to the defense of our best friend and ally in democracy who shares our values in the Middle East, Israel. Syria and the Soviet Union pitted against Israel, backed by the United States.

The Yom Kippur war led to the oil embargoes of 1973, which caused a reaction, leading eventually to this crude oil export ban. You might recall in the seventies, Mr. Speaker—I do, barely, but I do—the gas shortages, the rationing of gas, sales limited to 10 gallons of gas per customer, as is illustrated in this poster, this real picture of the 1970s.

Now, while it might have been a well-meaning policy to put a ban on exporting crude oil with the idea that somehow we could produce enough oil in the United States or, at least, we ought to hoard what we have, it is not like the United States was a leading producer of oil. We weren't what we are today.

Today, we are the number one producer of oil and gas. Gas, as you know, can be exported. By the way, refined petroleum products can also be exported.

So that is what led to the ban. The problem is, as I said earlier, this isn't 1973 anymore. This is not 1979. This is not 1989. This is a time when we have energy abundance. We have oil abundance to the point where we have every storage facility, including pipelines, ships, and tanks, full of oil. We are still producing light, sweet crude, I might add. In a little bit, I will get to the difference between that and this heavy sour crude and the various market mixes that demand that.

Mr. Speaker, as I started out reminding the Chamber, we passed H.R. 702 with 62 percent of the vote, a large bipartisan vote. That was a bill introduced by my friend, Representative JOE BARTON of Texas. He is in the Chamber with us, and I would like to yield such time as he would like to explain why this is such an important piece of this week's omnibus and tax package.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON).

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Speaker, the first thing that I want to do is commend the gentleman from North Dakota for his hard work on this. He is an original cosponsor of H.R. 702. He is a valued member of the ad hoc whip team that we put together.

He and I have worked the floor. We have had dinners with undecided Members. We have helped coordinate action efforts with some of the outside groups that are supportive.

You have been unflagging in his help on this. I could say similar things about the Speaker in the chair. The gentleman from Arkansas has also been a valued member of our team.

What I want to focus on is to explain to the Members what this means strategically to the United States of America. The world produces and consumes about 95 million barrels of oil per day right now; 95 million. Three countries, the United States, Saudi Arabia, and Russia, combined produce about 30 percent of that, a little over 30 million barrels a day between those three countries. Right now, Saudi Arabia would be number one, Russia would be number two, and the United States would be number three at about 9 million barrels a day production here in the United States.

Until this bill becomes law, which we hope will pass the House and the Senate and the President will sign it this weekend, if you want to change the world oil markets, it takes five or six phone calls. The chairman of OPEC, the Organization of the Petroleum Exporting Countries, who have their headquarters in Vienna, would make four or five phone calls to the various oil ministers of Saudi Arabia, Iran, Libya, Nigeria.

If they all agree on a price and a production quota, they have a meeting, they get all the member states to ratify it, and they set the price. A handful of people set the world price. That is the way it has been done since the mid-1970s during the Arab oil embargo.

If we repeal the ban on U.S. crude oil exports, which I think we are going to do, and the President signs the bill next week, we have about 500 million barrels of oil in storage in Oklahoma, Louisiana, and Texas, up in the Midwest where the gentleman is from. Believe it or not, there is some in California and some even up on the East Coast. There is privately owned oil that is just sitting there.

The chairman of OPEC calls those same five oil ministers and says, Boys, we need to raise the price. We are going to cut production. Each of you guys, your nation, we agree to cut production to half a million barrels a day. We are going to tighten up the market, and we are going to raise the price. And they all agree to do it.

Well, that word is going to get out. Somebody in Houston is going to say, Well, I have got 10 million barrels right here. Somebody in Corpus Christi, somebody in New Orleans, somebody in Mobile, Alabama, somebody in New York City or Long Beach, California, there will be oil on the market to replace the production cutbacks of OPEC, if not in minutes, in hours.

What we are doing is taking the keys from OPEC and giving the keys to the American people, the free market. Who has the biggest oil reserves in the world, if you include our alternative shale reserves? The United States of America. Who has the best technology in the world? United States of America. Who has the best people, the best seismic engineers, the best production engineers, the best oil field workers, the best truck drivers, the best pipeliners? The United States of America.

So, by golly, within a week, we are going to unleash the free market competitive enterprise of the American people on the world oil market. These other countries—Russia, Saudi Arabia, Iran, Iraq, Nigeria, and Libya—they can increase production a little bit, but there is only one country in the world that could literally double production within 4 or 5 years. Guess who that is? The United States of America.

So what we are doing this week in the omnibus—there are lots of reasons to be for it. If you want to take control of energy policy away from a handful of oil ministers who are primarily in the Middle East, vote for this bill and put control in the market. Let the Americans compete with the Mexicans and the Canadians and the Saudis and the Iraqis and the Russians and anybody else who wants to sell oil.

We don't realize what we are about to do, but it has tremendous economic and strategic implications for freedom everywhere in the world. You, sir, from North Dakota have helped make that possible. The gentleman in the chair from Arkansas has helped make that possible. The 262 Members of this House, Republicans and Democrats—HENRY CUELLAR of Laredo, Texas—has helped make that possible.

Next week is going to be a great week, it is going to be a milestone week, and we are going to look back, this is when we took back control from OPEC and gave it to the free market and to the American entrepreneurial spirit.

I thank Congressman CRAMER for his hard work. I am proud to have him as one of the leaders in this effort.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman BARTON for his kind words and his tireless effort on behalf of the employees, the workers, the economy of our country, and for articulating so beautifully and so perfectly, without rehearsal, the next chapter of what I began to talk about when I talk about the historical context. We are reliving much of that history right now.

As we think about ISIS, as we think about Iran and a path to a nuclear weapon, when we think about what is going on with Russia's movement further and further into Europe and its growing influence, the bear is back. Here we have the opportunity to use the peaceful tools of energy development rather than the weapons of war.

□ 1700

Never has the world needed it more. You talked about the bipartisan effort and how proud we are to work hand in hand with our Democratic Member friends, what a blessing that has been. One of the best, a gentleman that I have grown to not just know and appreciate, but to love, is Representative DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, whose heart for the things that matter has in many ways changed mine, I have to admit. He has changed mine.

He has offered amendments to multiple bills, an amendment to multiple

bills that I have now joined him in offering. It is not one on this bill, but I want to read the amendment because it is relevant to what we are doing. It is a simple amendment.

Representative SCOTT from Georgia offered this, and I join him in it, if not as an amendment, at least as an instruction. I quote now from his amendment:

Knowing that young Black men in the United States ages 18 to 37 are the hardest hit, at a 38 percent unemployment rate, and as high as 50 percent in some of our States and cities, the U.S. Congress, through this act, strongly requests the labor unions and contractors who will participate in the development of our oil infrastructure to actively recruit qualified said young Black men ages 18 to 37 for employment with their existing apprenticeship programs.

His amendment goes on to say:

These labor union apprenticeship programs will be conducted in conjunction with the National Electrical Contractors Association and the United Association of Journeymen and Apprentices of the Plumbing and Pipe Fitting Industry of the United States and Canada, under the auspices of the National Joint Apprenticeship and Training Committee, which allows apprentices to "Earn While You Learn."

As I said earlier, if we, as capitalists, people who support the free enterprise system—and this is clearly support of free markets—if we believe that a rising tide can lift all boats, let's lend a hand. Let's prove it. Let's prove it by giving more opportunities to populations that have disadvantages in our marketplace and prove to them that we can, in fact, lift all boats.

I might add—and, Chairman BARTON, if you want to explain some of this and comment on this—there is another important provision that was in H.R. 702 that is also part of this bill, and that gets to the use of support for the maritime security program. Would you be willing to share a couple minutes about that, because that is an important part of what we are doing.

Mr. BARTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BARTON. We have a fleet of privately owned ships that are normally in private commercial operation and that are owned by the companies that operate here in the ports of the United States. We pay a small fee each year from the Department of Defense so that, if these ships ever need to be used to transport military supplies overseas, they have to cease commercial operation and carry the military cargo.

They are only used when it is—I won't say an emergency, but a special situation. In this bill, we have some funding that increases the per-ship reimbursement rate slightly so that it makes it feasible for these ships to be on standby for our military to use. It was offered by the chairman of the full committee—I think Chairman FRED UPTON—when our bill was on the floor, and it was included in the manager's amendment. It was made part of the

bill then and is in the bill that is before us that we are going to vote on on Friday. It is a way to help in a cost-effective way our military when they need lift capacity to get military supplies overseas in a tense situation.

Mr. CRAMER. Making this vehicle another all-important appropriate vehicle for this amendment because the main piece of the omnibus package is, of course, increased spending for our defense. But you said cost effective. You are right, having these flagships available really saves the country the cost of about \$52 billion worth of building the ships, so it is a tremendous tool.

Mr. BARTON. It is a good deal for the taxpayer and a good deal for our troops.

Mr. CRAMER. It definitely is. Thank you for that, and thank you again for your leadership.

Mr. BARTON. Thank you for your leadership. I am going to have to excuse myself, but thank you for this Special Order.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I am going to wrap up, as well, with another history lesson. It is so interesting. I love history. I am not one who looks back a lot. I do like to look in the rear-view mirror once in a while to make sure I am still going straight as I move forward. I think we as a Congress and as a country need to do the same.

It was on this very day, December 16, 1773, that patriots at Boston Harbor expressed their displeasure with a foreign power's influence over what they felt was an essential commodity. Participants of the Boston Tea Party, many of whom were small-business owners, well versed in and practitioners of the teachings of Adam Smith and, yes, free market economics, never would have envisioned that one commodity should be arbitrarily discriminated against over another, especially by their own government. We have an opportunity with this commodity to make a difference.

Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time is left? I see that Chairman SHIMKUS is here and might have a word or two for us.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS), my good friend.

Mr. SHIMKUS. I want to thank my colleague from North Dakota and just say a couple things.

First of all, what we have done on the omnibus is great public policy. Crude oil is a commodity like corn and beans that should be sold on the world market.

Secondly, more oil on the world market lowers the prices for crude oil for everybody.

Thirdly, on the international security arena, and by focus on Europe, and primarily the old captive nations of Eastern Europe, is that they are being held hostage by energy extortion by the Russians. The more we put more

crude oil on the world market, the more that lowers the international price. That makes them have the opportunity to be free and independent from a totalitarian regime that is their neighbor to the east.

I appreciate my colleague offering me up an opportunity to address this.

Mr. CRAMER. That is the perfect wrap-up, Mr. SHIMKUS.

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

## RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 8 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1934

## AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia) at 7 o'clock and 34 minutes p.m.

## 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, December 16, 2015.

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 December 16, 2015 at 5:21 p.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 238.  
That the Senate passed with an amendment H.R. 3594.

With best wishes, I am  
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

## 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, December 16, 2015.

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 December 16, 2015 at 6:04 p.m.:

That the Senate agreed to without amendment H.J. Res. 78.

With best wishes, I am  
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 4 of rule I, the following enrolled bill was signed by the Speaker on Wednesday, December 16, 2015:

H.J. Res. 78, making further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2016, and for other purposes.

## REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 2029, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND VETERANS AFFAIRS AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2016; PROVIDING FOR PROCEEDINGS DURING THE PERIOD FROM DECEMBER 19, 2015, THROUGH JANUARY 4, 2016; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. COLE, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 114-382) on the resolution (H. Res. 566) providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 2029) making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes; providing for proceedings during the period from December 19, 2015, through January 4, 2016; and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CUELLAR (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and the balance of the week on account of death in family.

## SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 238. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, to authorize the Director of the Bureau of Prisons to issue oleoresin capicum spray to officers and employees of the Bureau of Prisons, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 571. An act to amend the Pilot's Bill of Rights to facilitate appeals and to apply to other certificates issued by the Federal Aviation Administration, to require the revision of the third class medical certification regulations issued by the Federal Aviation Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

## ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill and a joint resolution of the House of the following title, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 2270. An act to redesignate the Nisqually National Wildlife Refuge, located