

S. 2726

At the request of Mr. HELLER, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 2726, a bill to hold Iran accountable for its state sponsorship of terrorism and other threatening activities and for its human rights abuses, and for other purposes.

S. 2957

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2957, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint commemorative coins in recognition of the 50th anniversary of the first manned landing on the Moon.

S. 2962

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2962, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reform the low-income housing credit, and for other purposes.

S. 2989

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2989, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the United States merchant mariners of World War II, in recognition of their dedicated and vital service during World War II.

S. 3052

At the request of Mr. HELLER, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 3052, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide for an operation on a live donor for purposes of conducting a transplant procedure for a veteran, and for other purposes.

S. 3177

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3177, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the tax-exempt financing of certain government-owned buildings.

S. 3237

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the names of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) and the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) were added as cosponsors of S. 3237, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reform the low-income housing credit, and for other purposes.

S. 3384

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 3384, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a credit for middle-income housing, and for other purposes.

S. 3448

At the request of Mr. HELLER, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 3448, a bill to provide for the creation of the Missing Armed Forces Personnel Records Collection at the National Archives, to require the expeditious public transmission to the Archivist and

the public disclosure of Missing Armed Forces Personnel records, and for other purposes.

S. 3478

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the names of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) were added as cosponsors of S. 3478, a bill to require continued and enhanced annual reporting to Congress in the Annual Report on International Religious Freedom on anti-Semitic incidents in Europe, the safety and security of European Jewish communities, and the efforts of the United States to partner with European governments, the European Union, and civil society groups, to combat anti-Semitism, and for other purposes.

S. 3491

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3491, a bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act and the Electronic Fund Transfer Act to provide justice to victims of fraud.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. SCHATZ (for himself, Mr. BROWN, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. WARREN, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. PETERS, Mr. TESTER, and Mr. HEINRICH):

S. 3525. A bill to enhance the security operations of the Transportation Security Administration and the stability of the transportation security workforce by applying a unified personnel system under title 5, United States Code, to employees of the Transportation Security Administration who are responsible for screening passengers and property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Mr. SCHATZ. Mr. President, the legislation I will introduce shortly focuses on a small sector of the Federal workforce. But there is a broader message that I would like to deliver as well today. There is something I want to say to all Federal workers: I have got your back.

We have all been hearing statements by politicians in the halls of Congress, in the news, and even on Twitter threatening to gut the Federal workforce, cut earned benefits, reduce paychecks, make it easier to fire people at will, and other destructive and misguided actions.

To Federal employees, these statements must be particularly hurtful. Some may feel anxious and disheartened. But I want to assure all Federal workers that I am on your side. Your contributions are integral to our Nation. You live and work in small towns, in urban centers, and around the country. You do crucial work for our government and for the American people.

As the capital of the United States, Washington, D.C., is often mistaken as the primary location for Federal workers. But this is patently false. Eighty-

five per cent of Federal workers actually live and work outside of the D.C. area. Federal workers live and work in every town, city, and State. In many places, the Federal Government is the main employer—and those jobs are vital to the local economy. The Federal workforce represents the diversity of our country.

Since 1960, the GDP has multiplied five times, new agencies have been added to the government, and the responsibilities of Federal workers have grown exponentially, and yet hiring has stagnated. The civilian workforce, not including Postal Service employees, is roughly the same size it was during the Kennedy administration, at around 2 million.

Pledges from short-sighted politicians about privatizing government services and programs like Medicare and Social Security would cause many Federal jobs to vanish and impair access to Federal services. This would put real Americans out of work and cause measurable economic hardship to local and State economies.

In addition, the government is the number one employer of veterans, particularly disabled veterans who have trouble finding jobs in the private sector. Freezing hiring or cutting the workforce means fewer opportunities for America's heroes.

That is why I want the next administration to understand the importance of Federal workers. Their jobs cannot be outsourced, replaced by machines, cut, or consolidated. I would urge the next administration to stop using our Federal workforce for purposes of partisan rhetoric and political games.

I want to let Federal workers know that I will continue to work in the Senate to fight efforts to undermine you and the work that you do. I will look for opportunities to improve the Federal workplace and strengthen the Federal workforce. So keep up the good work across America. You can count on me for support.

Today I also rise to introduce the Strengthening American Transportation Security Act of 2016, SATSA. This bill would extend to Transportation Security Officers, TSO, the same worker rights and protections under Title 5 of the U.S. Code that most other Federal workers enjoy and that TSOs are currently denied.

TSOs are Federal employees who work on the frontlines of aviation security, and make up 70 percent of the Transportation Security Administration's workforce. They provide essential protection to all Americans by screening passengers and baggage at our airports.

Every day TSOs stop eight guns from getting on our airplanes. That's nearly 3,000 guns a year. They hold life-saving jobs and TSOs deserve parity under Title 5 of the U.S. Code. My bill would provide fair treatment to TSO's and, in doing so, would improve passenger

safety and enhance the overall capacity of the Federal workforce responsible for protecting our aviation transportation system.

I am proud to introduce SATSA, which would improve the morale and stability of TSOs, the Federal workers keeping our airports and aviation travel safe. I want to thank my colleagues that have joined as original cosponsors of this bill: Senators BROWN, MERKLEY, WARREN, FRANKEN, PETERS, TESTER, and HEINRICH.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3525

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the “Strengthening American Transportation Security 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. Findings; sense of Congress.
- Sec. 3. Definitions.
- Sec. 4. Conversion of screening personnel.
- Sec. 5. Transition rules.
- Sec. 6. Consultation requirement.
- Sec. 7. No right to strike.
- Sec. 8. Regulations.
- Sec. 9. Delegations to Administrator.
- Sec. 10. Authorization of appropriations.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS; SENSE OF CONGRESS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) On September 11, 2001, 19 terrorists, who underwent airport security screening prior to boarding domestic flights, were able to commandeer 4 airplanes and use those airplanes to perpetrate the most deadly terrorist attack ever to be executed on United States soil.

(2) In the aftermath of those attacks, Congress passed the Aviation and Transportation Security Act (Public Law 107-71), which was signed into law by President George W. Bush on November 19, 2001—

(A) to enhance the level of security screening throughout our aviation system; and

(B) to transfer responsibility for such screening from the private sector to the newly established Transportation Security Administration (referred to in this section as “TSA”).

(3) By establishing TSA, Congress and the American public recognized that the highest level of screener performance was directly linked to employment and training standards, pay and benefits, and the creation of an experienced, committed screening workforce.

(4) Section 111(d) of the Aviation and Transportation Security Act (49 U.S.C. 44935 note) authorizes the Under Secretary of Transportation for Security to “employ, appoint, discipline, terminate, and fix the compensation, terms, and conditions of employment of Federal service for such a number of individuals as the Under Secretary determines to be necessary to carry out the screening functions of the Under Secretary under section 44901 of title 49, United States Code”. The functions of the TSA were transferred to the Department of Homeland Security by section 403 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 203).

(5) TSA has interpreted the authorization set forth in paragraph (4) as applying to the

majority of the Transportation Security Officer workforce performing screening functions, while all other Transportation Security Administration employees, including managers, are subject to title 5, United States Code, as incorporated in title 49 of such Code.

(6) In November 2006, the International Labor Organization ruled that the Bush Administration violated international labor law when it prohibited Transportation Security Officers from engaging in collective bargaining.

(7) After the Federal Labor Relations Board approved a petition for the election of an exclusive representative, on February 4, 2011, TSA Administrator John Pistole issued a binding determination stating that “it is critical that every TSA employee feels that he or she has a voice and feels safe raising issues and concerns of all kinds. This is important not just for morale; engagement of every employee is critically important for security.”.

(8) This determination was superseded by a second determination issued on December 29, 2014, which changed the previous guideline for collective bargaining and resulting in limitations in the subjects that can be bargained, issues in dispute that may be raised to an independent, third-party neutral decision maker (such as an arbitrator or the Merit Systems Protection Board), and barriers to union representation of the Transportation Security Officer workforce.

(9) The 2011 and 2014 determinations both cited TSA’s authority under section 111(d) of the Aviation and Transportation Security Act (49 U.S.C. 44935 note) to create a personnel system that denies the Transportation Security Officer workforce the rights under title 5, United States Code, that are provided to most other Federal workers, including—

(A) the right to appeal adverse personnel decisions to the Merit Systems Protection Board;

(B) fair pay under the General Services wage system, 2011;

(C) fair pay and raises under the General Services wage system, including overtime guidelines, access to earned leave;

(D) the application of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 201 et seq.);

(E) fair performance appraisals under chapter 73 of title 5, United States Code; and

(F) direct protections against employment discrimination set forth in title 7, United States Code.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the personnel system utilized by the Transportation Security Administration pursuant to section 111(d) of the Aviation and Transportation Security Act (49 U.S.C. 44935 note) provides insufficient workplace protections for the Transportation Security Officer workforce, who are the frontline personnel who secure our Nation’s aviation system; and

(2) such personnel should be entitled to the protections under title 5, United States Code.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) ADMINISTRATOR.—The term “Administrator” means the official within the Department of Homeland Security who is responsible for overseeing and implementing transportation security pursuant to the Aviation and Transportation Security Act, whether designated as the Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security (Transportation Security Administration), the Administrator of the Transportation Security Administration, the Undersecretary of Transportation for Security, or otherwise.

(2) AGENCY.—The term “agency” means an Executive agency, as defined by section 105 of title 5, United States Code.

(3) CONVERSION DATE.—The term “conversion date” means the date as of which paragraphs (1) through (3) of section 3(b) take effect.

(4) COVERED EMPLOYEE.—The term “covered employee” means an employee who holds a covered position.

(5) COVERED POSITION.—The term “covered position” means—

(A) a position within the Transportation Security Administration; and

(B) any position within the Department of Homeland Security, not described in subparagraph (A), the duties and responsibilities of which involve providing transportation security in furtherance of the purposes of the Aviation and Transportation Security Act (Public Law 107-71), as determined by the Secretary.

(6) EMPLOYEE.—The term “employee” has the meaning given such term by section 2105 of title 5, United States Code.

(7) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Homeland Security.

(8) TSA PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT SYSTEM.—The term “TSA personnel management system” means any personnel management system established or modified under—

(A) section 111(d) of the Aviation and Transportation Security Act (49 U.S.C. 44935 note); or

(B) section 114(n) of title 49, United States Code.

SEC. 4. CONVERSION OF SCREENING PERSONNEL.

(a) TERMINATION OF CERTAIN PERSONNEL AUTHORITIES.—

(1) TSA PERSONAL MANAGEMENT SYSTEM.—Section 114 of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking subsection (n).

(2) TERMINATION OF FLEXIBILITY IN EMPLOYMENT OF SCREENER PERSONNEL.—Section 111 of the Aviation and Transportation Security Act (49 U.S.C. 44935 note) is amended by striking subsection (d).

(3) HUMAN RESOURCES MANAGEMENT SYSTEM.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Section 9701 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(i) by redesignating subsection (h) as subsection (i); and

(ii) by inserting after subsection (g) the following:

“(h) LIMITATION.—The human resources management system authorized under this section shall not apply to covered employees or covered positions (as such terms are defined in section 3 of the Strengthening American Transportation Security Act of 2016).”.

(B) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subparagraph (A) shall take effect on the date set forth in subsection (b).

(b) COVERED EMPLOYEES AND POSITIONS MADE SUBJECT TO SAME PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT SYSTEM AS APPLIES TO CIVIL SERVICE EMPLOYEES GENERALLY.—On the earlier of a date determined by the Secretary or 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act—

(1) all TSA personnel management personnel policies, directives, letters, and guidelines, including the Determinations of February 2011 and December 2014 shall cease to be effective;

(2) any human resources management system established or adjusted under section 9701 of title 5, United States Code, shall cease to be effective with respect to covered employees and covered positions; and

(3) covered employees and covered positions shall become subject to the applicable labor provisions under title 49, United States Code.

SEC. 5. TRANSITION RULES.

(a) **NONREDUCTION IN RATE OF PAY.**—Any conversion of an employee from a TSA personnel management system to the provisions of law referred to in section 4(b)(3) shall be effected, under pay conversion rules prescribed by the Secretary, without any reduction in the rate of basic pay payable to such employee.

(b) **PRESERVATION OF OTHER RIGHTS.**—The Secretary shall take any necessary actions to ensure, for any covered employee as of the conversion date, that—

(1) all service performed by such covered employee before the conversion date is credited in the determination of such employee's length of service for purposes of applying the provisions of law governing leave, pay, group life and health insurance, severance pay, tenure, and status, which are made applicable to such employee under section 4(b)(3);

(2) all annual leave, sick leave, or other paid leave accrued, accumulated, or otherwise available to the covered employee immediately before the conversion date remains available to the employee, until used, while the employee remains continuously employed by the Department of Homeland Security; and

(3) the Government share of any premiums or other periodic charges under the provisions of law governing group health insurance remains at the level in effect immediately before the conversion date while the employee remains continuously employed by the Department of Homeland Security.

SEC. 6. CONSULTATION REQUIREMENT.

(a) **EXCLUSIVE REPRESENTATIVE.**—The labor organization certified by the Federal Labor Relations Authority on June 29, 2011, or successor organization shall be deemed the exclusive representative of full- and part-time nonsupervisory personnel carrying out screening functions under section 44901 of title 49, United States Code under chapter 71 of title 5, United States Code, with full rights under such chapter 71.

(b) **CONSULTATION RIGHTS.**—Not later than 14 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall—

(1) consult with the exclusive representative for employees under chapter 71 of title 5, United States Code, on the formulation of plans and deadlines to carry out the conversion of covered employees and covered positions under this Act; and

(2) provide final written plans to the exclusive representative on how the Secretary intends to carry out the conversion of covered employees and covered positions under this Act, including with respect to—

(A) the proposed conversion date; and
(B) measures to ensure compliance with section 5.

(c) **REQUIRED AGENCY RESPONSE.**—If any views or recommendations are presented under subsection (b)(2) by the exclusive representative, the Secretary shall consider the views or recommendations before taking final action on any matter with respect to which the views or recommendations are presented and provide the exclusive representative a written statement of the reasons for the final actions to be taken.

(d) **SUNSET PROVISION.**—The provisions of this section shall cease to be effective as of the conversion date.

SEC. 7. NO RIGHT TO STRIKE.

Nothing in this Act may be construed—

(1) to repeal or otherwise affect—
(A) section 1918 of title 18, United States Code (relating to disloyalty and asserting the right to strike against the Government); or

(B) section 7311 of title 5, United States Code (relating to loyalty and striking); or

(2) to otherwise authorize any activity which is not permitted under either provision of law cited in paragraph (1).

SEC. 8. REGULATIONS.

The Secretary may prescribe any regulations that may be necessary to carry out this Act.

SEC. 9. DELEGATIONS TO ADMINISTRATOR.

The Secretary may, with respect to any authority or function vested in the Secretary under any of the preceding provisions of this Act, delegate any such authority or function to the Administrator of the Transportation Security Administration under such terms, conditions, and limitations, including the power of redelegation, as the Secretary considers appropriate.

SEC. 10. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this Act.

By Mr. CARDIN:

S. 3529. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a progressive consumption tax and to reform the income tax, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I am pleased to introduce the Progressive Consumption Tax Act of 2016.

We need a tax code that is fair for American employers and fair for American families. We need a tax code that makes our U.S.-based businesses more competitive. Finally, we need a tax code that allows us to responsibly and reliably collect reasonable revenues.

I introduced a version of this bill in the 113th Congress to provide an opening for discussion and a first opportunity to review legislative language for this type of comprehensive tax reform.

Since the introduction of the Progressive Consumption Tax Act, many policymakers, including in Congress, have become increasingly interested in moving to a border-adjustable consumption tax base.

As we move towards consideration of comprehensive tax reform in 2017, I wanted to reintroduce an updated version of this bill, which I think shows what progressive, fiscally responsible, pro-growth tax reform could look like.

As many of my colleagues recognize, the extent to which we rely on income taxes is very out of step with the rest of the world.

Compared to other countries that are in the OECD—developed countries with advanced economies, countries that we want to be competitive with—all taxes as a percentage of GDP in the United States are low.

But, the U.S. is not a low income tax country. Our income tax revenues as a percentage of GDP are higher than the OECD countries. We have some of the highest statutory income tax rates in the world.

What accounts for the difference is that all OECD countries except the U.S. have a consumption tax. In fact, about 150 countries now have a consumption tax, many of which were enacted decades ago.

Unlike the U.S., these countries can tax imports and subsidize exports by rebating their consumption taxes for exports—without violating current World Trade Organization, WTO, rules.

As important, these countries can sustain reductions in their corporate income tax rates, because they have an alternative and more pro-growth revenue source—a consumption tax.

The Progressive Consumption Tax Act puts this country on a competitive playing field by providing for a broad-based progressive consumption tax, or PCT, at a rate of 10 percent. The PCT would generate revenue by taxing goods and services, rather than income.

This is not simply an add-on tax. The revenues generated by the act would be used to eliminate an income tax liability for most households. This bears repeating: instead of paying an income tax, most Americans households, under this bill, would only pay a consumption tax.

Those who do still have an income tax liability would see a much simplified income tax with their marginal rates reduced—the top marginal individual income tax rate, applying to taxable income over \$500,000 for joint filers, would be 28 percent. The current top marginal rate, applying to taxable income over approximately \$450,000 for joint filers, is 39.6 percent.

Four important tax benefits remain: the charitable contribution deduction, the state and local tax deduction, health and retirement benefits, and the mortgage interest deduction.

The act would also slice our corporate rate by more than half, to 17 percent.

Finally, the act would provide rebates to lower- and moderate-income families to counteract their consumption tax burden and to replace essential support programs like the Earned Income Tax Credit and Child Tax Credit. Like the EITC and CTC, Individuals and families who do not have an income tax liability would still be able to receive these rebates.

A key part of the act is progressivity. By eliminating an income tax liability for a significant number of households and providing rebates, the act is meant to be at least as progressive as the current system.

The act is also meant to responsibly raise reasonable revenues. I know that some have concerns that the act would just provide a new lever for the government to raise funds. That is why the act contains a revenue “circuit breaker” mechanism that returns excess PCT revenues to taxpayers if a certain threshold is met. The PCT is not meant to be a means to quickly raise revenues while disregarding the effects of higher consumption taxes on U.S. families and employers.

Overall, the Progressive Consumption Tax Act has many advantages compared to past reform efforts.

First, it encourages saving. Under current law, families and individuals are taxed on income, which includes savings. Under the act, most households would be exempt from the income tax, and thus would be able to save tax free.

The act enhances U.S. economic competitiveness. The U.S. corporate income tax rate would be lowered to 17

percent, encouraging multinational corporations to locate here, not abroad. OECD countries currently attracting U.S. multinationals often impose higher consumption or corporate tax rates than those envisioned by the act.

In fact, if the Progressive Consumption Tax Act became law, every top statutory rate in the United States—our individual income tax rate, our corporate tax rate, our consumption tax rate—would be at least five percentage points lower than the OECD average.

The act encourages economic growth. In a study that examined 35 years of data on 21 OECD countries, consumption taxes were found to be more growth-friendly than both personal income taxes and corporate income taxes. Corporate income taxes, especially, appear to have the most negative effect on GDP per capita. Growth-oriented tax reform should move away from income tax revenues and towards consumption tax revenues, as the act does.

The act also enhances U.S. trade competitiveness. Countries with consumption taxes can adjust their taxes at the border by rebating exports. That means that these countries can agree to reduced tariffs under trade agreements, can still tax imports with their consumption taxes, and can export their own goods without a full tax load. Because the PCT is border-adjusted, the U.S. would be able to maintain export and import tax parity in the same way as these other countries. In addition, the PCT is designed to achieve these benefits while being compliant with WTO rules.

The act reduces income tax compliance costs. Most households would not have an income tax liability under the act—although they would need to provide key pieces of information to the IRS in order to obtain their rebates.

Finally, the act protects low- and middle-income families from an unfair tax burden. Through the income tax exemption and rebate feature, the Progressive Consumption Tax Act aims to ensure that this new tax system is at least as progressive as the current income tax system.

When my colleagues and others talk to me about comprehensive, responsible, pro-growth tax reform, this to me is what we need to do.

That is why I am pleased to reintroduce the Progressive Consumption Tax Act in this Congress. This newest version of the act responds to input from stakeholders that we received last year. As important, the act shows exactly what serious, comprehensive consumption-based tax reform legislation looks like.

As this Congress closes and the new Congress convenes, I hope we will stand for what is right in our tax code, and enact the type of reform that allows our country to have among the lowest tax rates in the industrialized world, and the fairest system for all Americans.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 5139. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2028, making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes.

SA 5140. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 5139 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill H.R. 2028, *supra*.

SA 5141. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2028, *supra*.

SA 5142. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 5141 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill H.R. 2028, *supra*.

SA 5143. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 5142 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the amendment SA 5141 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill H.R. 2028, *supra*.

SA 5144. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to the bill S. 612, to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 1300 Victoria Street in Laredo, Texas, as the “George P. Kazen Federal Building and United States Courthouse”.

SA 5145. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 5144 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill S. 612, *supra*.

SA 5146. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to the bill S. 612, *supra*.

SA 5147. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 5146 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill S. 612, *supra*.

SA 5148. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 5147 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the amendment SA 5146 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill S. 612, *supra*.

SA 5149. Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Mr. BROWN, and Mr. CASEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 612, *supra*; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5150. Mr. HELLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2028, making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 5139. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2028, making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the end add the following:

“This act shall be effective 1 day after enactment.”

SA 5140. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 5139 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill H.R. 2028, making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes; as follows:

Strike “1 day” and insert “2 days”.

SA 5141. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2028, making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending Sep-

tember 30, 2016, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the end add the following:

“This act shall be effective 3 days after enactment.”

SA 5142. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 5141 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill H.R. 2028, making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes; as follows:

Strike “3 days” and insert “4 days”.

SA 5143. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 5142 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the amendment SA 5141 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill H.R. 2028, making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes; as follows:

Strike “4” and insert “5”.

SA 5144. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to the bill S. 612, to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 1300 Victoria Street in Laredo, Texas, as the “George P. Kazen Federal Building and United States Courthouse”; as follows:

At the end add the following:

“This act shall be effective 1 day after enactment.”

SA 5145. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 5144 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill S. 612, to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 1300 Victoria Street in Laredo, Texas, as the “George P. Kazen Federal Building and United States Courthouse”; as follows:

Strike “1 day” and insert “2 days”.

SA 5146. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to the bill S. 612, to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 1300 Victoria Street in Laredo, Texas, as the “George P. Kazen Federal Building and United States Courthouse”; as follows:

At the end add the following:

“This act shall be effective 3 days after enactment.”

SA 5147. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 5146 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill S. 612, to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 1300 Victoria Street in Laredo, Texas, as the “George P. Kazen Federal Building and United States Courthouse”; as follows:

Strike “3 days” and insert “4 days”.

SA 5148. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 5147 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the amendment SA 5146 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill S. 612, to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 1300 Victoria Street in Laredo, Texas, as the