United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 160 WASHINGTON, MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 15, 2014 *No. 131*

House of Representatives

The House met at noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PETRI).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, September 15, 2014.

I hereby appoint the Honorable THOMAS E. PETRI to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2014, 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 1:50 p.m.

23 IN 1—FABENS, TEXAS

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

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Speaker, today as we continue our journey through the 23rd District in which I take viewers and listeners on a 1-minute journey through the district, through its towns, its cities, its cultures, and its people, this morning I have the great privilege of highlighting Fabens, Texas.

Fabens is located in the Mission Valley south of El Paso and, as of the 2010 census, had a population of 8,257 people. It is about 30 miles southeast of El Paso, located along the Rio Grande River and I–10.

Known as the home of the Wildcats, Fabens has long been a fierce competitor and a rival of my own Alpine Bucks. In fact, I still remember rather vividly when Alpine lost the district championship in football to Fabens my senior year of high school in 1980. I don't think anyone in either Alpine or Fabens has ever forgotten that football game. Kids in Fabens are competitors, whether in sports or academic competitions, and their prowess is known far and wide.

The history of the community itself dates from the late 19th century, though in 1665 a mission branch known as San Francisco de los Sumas was established just southeast of the future site of Fabens. A stagecoach station called San Felipe was in operation about 3 miles northeast of the site before 1870.

In the 1870s, Teodoro and Epitacia Alvarez owned a small farm on the actual site of what is now Fabens. That farm was known as the Mezquital. In 1887, the town site was sold to E.S. Newman, and the first permanent settler in what is now Fabens became Eugenio Perez, who came from San Elizario around 1900.

Mr. Perez himself owned a small farm, opened a small store; and shortly thereafter, when the Galveston, Harrisburg, and San Antonio Railway built through the area and established a water-pumping station, the community began to grow. In 1906, this store became the very first Fabens post office.

The town of Fabens itself, when you think about the name ''Fabens,'' where did that come from? It was named for George Fabens, an officer with the Southern Pacific Railroad.

In 1910, Fabens had just a few section houses for the railroad employees and two stores; and in 1914, the estimated population was only about 100, but the next few years brought many to the area as people began fleeing the Mexican Revolution.

The town site was laid out in 1911, but the development didn't really happen until the Fabens Townsite and Improvement Company bought it in 1915. The completion in 1956 of the Franklin Canal and the subsequent rise in cotton prices during World War I attracted a number of wealthy visitors to the area.

The rolling fields of the area, nestled in the shadow of the mountains to the west and immediately adjacent to the Rio Grande, were and still are perfect for farming.

The estimated population rose from 50 in 1925 to 2,000 2 years later, despite a major flood at that time. The price of cotton dropping and going up has all impacted Fabens. During the Great Depression, the estimated population of Fabens fell to 1,600. But in the early 1930s, as the Depression took hold, it fell and fell; but at the end of the 1930s, by about 1939, it had started an upward trend again.

In April of 1972, Fabens served as the location for the filming of the Sam Peckinpah film, ''The Getaway.'' The crime drama starred Steve McQueen and Ali MacGraw. Movie scenes were shot in the area and included explosions and car chases and shootouts. The film became a success and earned a big sum for those days of $25 million at the box office.

Today Fabens is also home to one of west Texas' most popular and famous restaurants, the Cattleman's Steakhouse. The steakhouse serves delicious food, and it too has played a role in several movies.

Fabens is also the home of jockey Bill Shoemaker.

As I indicated earlier, kids in Fabens are served by the Fabens Independent School District and are known as the Wildcats. Many teachers in the Fabens ISD got their degrees from my own alma mater, my college alma mater, Sul Ross State University. Perhaps

Printed on recycled paper.

that is part of the reason I always feel so at home in visiting Fabens.

The next time you are in the 23rd District of Texas, I invite you too to visit Fabens, to enjoy the hospitality, to see the sights, and to learn the history of Fabens and all of west Texas.

UNINTENDED CONSEQUENCES OF OBAMACARE CONTINUE TO PILE UP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I would like to offer half a cheer for the recent news that the benchmark price for a ''silver'' level ObamaCare plan will drop very slightly in FY 2015. Why only half a cheer? As economics writer Megan McCardle recently noted:

Contrary to optimistic early reports, that doesn't mean that everyone's costs are falling. Consumers will have to be attentive to make sure that their costs don't go up. The worse news: we won't actually know what effect the Affordable Care Act is having on insurance prices until 2017, when a bunch of temporary subsidies for insurers expire.

She goes on to note that the various ''risk corridors'' and other incentives which the Obama administration created to get insurers to participate in ObamaCare are preventing us from knowing the real cost of the President's disastrous health care law. McCardle writes:

Right now, it's just not very risky for insurers to write a policy that loses a bunch of money because your losses are capped at a few percent. Starting in 2017, all that changes. Insurers are going to need to price policies with the expectation of making money and the fear of losing it.

Mr. Speaker, I will pause for a moment to note that socialized losses combined with private profits are a hallmark of the crony capitalism of the ObamaCare era. Sadly, even in these heavily subsidized years, Americans are still suffering from price shock on their health insurance plan. As a constituent recently wrote to me:

Virginia, here we go again. I just received a letter from my health insurance carrier that my policy will no longer be available after December 31, 2014, due to not being ACA compliant. I will now be looking at $600-a-month premiums as I am not eligible for a subsidy because I could go on my wife's policy for $650 a month. $600 would be over 20 percent of my take-home pay. We need your help to keep our current plan as promised or change the ACA.

ObamaCare's problems extend beyond high prices. I recently received a letter from a constituent—a middle-aged woman recovering from breast cancer—who was simultaneously dealing with the consequences of ObamaCare and the Obama economy.

In 2013, I was laid off from a job I had for almost 8 years. I opened a business instead of drawing unemployment. This year, the building I was leasing was sold and the new owners would not let me stay. My life savings went into building this and now it was gone. No money to start over about the same time I find I had breast cancer. I had tried to sign up for ObamaCare months before, but because my husband and I file our taxes separately, I did not qualify for subsidies regardless of my income. So here I am, no insurance, no income, with breast cancer. I do not qualify for disability because I don't expect to be disabled for at least 12 months. I do not qualify for Medicaid because of the guidelines for that.

I have paid my taxes and worked hard all my life and my government does not care about that.

Is this messed up or what?

Mr. Speaker, the law is messed up. The unintended consequences of ObamaCare continue to pile up for hardworking Americans across the country. When will this administration learn that it does not have the knowledge or ability to effectively, efficiently, and fairly manage the economic and health care choices of over 300 million Americans from Washington?

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MESSER) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God of the universe, we give You thanks for giving us another day. We thank You that You give us a share in Your creative work, having endowed each with unique and important talents.

On this day we ask Your blessing on the men and women of the people's House who have been entrusted with the care of this great Nation's people. Because of the great blessings You have bestowed on our Nation, may we embrace the opportunity to build a better world beyond our borders as well.

As another election approaches, Members are understandably focused on their campaigns. Give them the energy and courage to remain focused as well on the demands of office facing them now. This is difficult, but our Nation and our world have many issues calling for attention, and these few have the privilege of addressing them with some hope of bringing resolution that may be of benefit to us all.

May all they do this day be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. PITTS 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.

ELKS 125TH ANNIVERSARY

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

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the Lancaster Elks Lodge on their 125 years of service to our community.

The Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks was founded in 1868, and just over 2 decades later, the Lancaster branch first met, growing from 24 members at the beginning to more than 600 today.

For nearly 150 years now, Elks have engaged in service to their communities, focused on veterans, youth, and our Nation.

The Elks count among their past members a number of distinguished Americans, including five men who served as Speaker of this House.

Nationwide, the organization donates $3.65 million to send kids to college. Locally, the Lancaster Elks are known for their children's sports leagues and events.

The Elks support our local veterans and servicemembers, making sure that they are honored for their dedication to our country.

Thank you again to the Lancaster Elks for their contributions to our community. I am looking forward to celebrating this great anniversary with them on November 1.

THE AUGUST JOBS REPORT

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, the August jobs report is out, and it contains more bad news. The 6-month trend creating 200,000-plus jobs is over.

Consider that in order to return to its previous pre-recession levels, the economy needs to add more than 380,000 private sector jobs every month. 200,000 is barely half of the needed number, and this month we dropped to 142,000 new jobs.

This ''new normal'' might be okay for Washington and the booming public sector, but it is not okay with the millions of Americans struggling to find work and the millions more who have given up looking altogether.

The House has passed more than 40 bills that would address our struggling economy and help create jobs. These bills are now sitting in the Senate while that body debates whether or not to gut the First Amendment.

Maybe if the Senators acted on some of these House-passed bills they wouldn't have to spend so much time worrying about what people are saying about them.

GOSPEL MUSIC HISTORY MONTH

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, sometimes we have the opportunity to come and to share some of the joys of America. This month is gospel music history month, and I am delighted to be able to say that we are celebrating the history of gospel music.

In 2008, former Senator Blanche Lincoln and myself introduced a resolution to name September gospel music heritage month, and we are doing that to be able to reflect upon the writers and singers and musicians of gospel music throughout the country, in different areas around, in Appalachia and the Deep South and Midwest and the Far West and the east coast where people sing it in their own way, where soldiers sing the music and people sing it for comfort and joy.

Tonight at the Kennedy Center, we will be honoring the former Senator, Blanche Lincoln, of Arkansas with Yolanda Adams and Kirk Franklin. These are individuals who represent a long trend of history in gospel music, but the real idea is to say that America is such a free and wonderful country that we can reflect upon the goodness of so many, singing songs of joy and praise, without the degradation and the trepidation of government interference, gospel music heritage, simply to say thank you—thank you for the music over the years.

From the 1700s and 1800s and 1900s, through war and peace, gospel music has been a comfort to many Americans. I am delighted to celebrate and thank all of those who have contributed to the great history of America, gospel music history month.

TRIBUTE TO KEVIE NILAND ON HER RETIREMENT

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

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the career of my constituent Kevie Niland who recently retired after 34 years of service to the United States House of Representatives.

Kevie came to the House in 1980 to be a constituent service coordinator for Congressman Miller, beginning a long career of service to the American people. She later moved to the Clerk's office, starting as an administrative assistant before becoming Assistant Clerk to the Official Reporters in 1995. Four years later, she was named Reading Clerk, and then, in 2009, she took the office of Deputy Chief of Legislative Operations for the House of Representatives.

Kevie served under seven Speakers of the House, from Tip O'Neill to JOHN BOEHNER, and has had a front seat for many historic and spirited debates in this Chamber. I have encouraged her to write a book, but she has responded, ''No one would believe it.'' Her extraordinary efforts to record and support the work of the House makes our actions open and transparent to all American citizens and holds each of us accountable to the constituents we serve.

I know Kevie plans to take a well-deserved vacation, but I expect that she will continue to find ways to serve her community. I know we all feel very lucky to have benefited from her work here in the House.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Kevie Niland on her outstanding and productive service to this body and to our country and wish her the very best in her well-earned retirement.

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 11, 2014.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
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 11, 2014 at 4:44 p.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 2258.

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 4197.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 4 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 9 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1600

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of New York) at 4 p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on 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.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

DESIGNER ANABOLIC STEROID CONTROL ACT OF 2014

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4771) to amend the Controlled Substances Act to more effectively regulate anabolic steroids, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4771

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 ''Designer Anabolic Steroid Control Act of 2014''.

SEC. 2. AMENDMENTS TO THE CONTROLLED SUBSTANCES ACT.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—Section 102(41) of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 802(41)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A)—

(A) in clause (xlix), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(B) by redesignating clause (xlx) as clause (lxxv); and

(C) by inserting after clause (xlix) the following:

''(l) 5α-Androstan-3,6,17-trione;

''(li) 6-bromo-androstan-3,17-dione;

''(lii) 6-bromo-androsta-1,4-diene-3,17-dione;

''(liii) 4-chloro-17α-methyl-androsta-1,4-diene-3,17β-diol;

''(liv) 4-chloro-17α-methyl-androst-4-ene-3β,17β-diol;

''(lv) 4-chloro-17α-methyl-17β-hydroxy-androst-4-en-3-one;

''(lvi) 4-chloro-17α-methyl-17β-hydroxy-androst-4-ene-3,11-dione;

''(lvii) 4-chloro-17α-methyl-androsta-1,4-diene-3,17β-diol;

''(lviii) 2α,17α-dimethyl-17β-hydroxy-5α-androstan-3-one;

''(lix) 2α,17α-dimethyl-17β-hydroxy-5β-androstan-3-one;

''(lx) 2α,3α-epithio-17α-methyl-5α-androstan-17β-ol;

''(lxi) [3,2-c]-furazan-5α-androstan-17β-ol;

''(lxii) 3β-hydroxy-estra-4,9,11-trien-17-one;

''(lxiii) 17α-methyl-androst-2-ene-3,17β-diol;

''(lxiv) 17α-methyl-androsta-1,4-diene-3,17β-diol;

''(lxv) Estra-4,9,11-triene-3,17-dione;

''(lxvi) 18a-Homo-3-hydroxy-estra-2,5(10)-dien-17-one;

''(lxvii) 6α-Methyl-androst-4-ene-3,17-dione;

''(lxviii) 17α-Methyl-androstan-3-hydroxyimine-17β-ol;

''(lxix) 17α-Methyl-5α-androstan-17β-ol;

''(lxx) 17β-Hydroxy-androstano[2,3-d]isoxazole;

''(lxxi) 17β-Hydroxy-androstano[3,2-c]isoxazole;

''(lxxii) 4-Hydroxy-androst-4-ene-3,17-dione[3,2-c]pyrazole-5α-androstan-17β-ol;

''(lxxiii) [3,2-c]pyrazole-androst-4-en-17β-ol;

''(lxxiv) [3,2-c]pyrazole-5α-androstan-17β-ol; and''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(C)(i) Subject to clause (ii), a drug or hormonal substance (other than estrogens, progestins, corticosteroids, and dehydroepiandrosterone) that is not listed in subparagraph (A) and is derived from, or has

a chemical structure substantially similar to, 1 or more anabolic steroids listed in subparagraph (A) shall be considered to be an anabolic steroid for purposes of this Act if—

''(I) the drug or substance has been created or manufactured with the intent of producing a drug or other substance that either—

''(aa) promotes muscle growth; or

''(bb) otherwise causes a pharmacological effect similar to that of testosterone; or

''(II) the drug or substance has been, or is intended to be, marketed or otherwise promoted in any manner suggesting that consuming it will promote muscle growth or any other pharmacological effect similar to that of testosterone.

''(ii) A substance shall not be considered to be a drug or hormonal substance for purposes of this subparagraph if it—

''(I) is—

''(aa) an herb or other botanical;

''(bb) a concentrate, metabolite, or extract of, or a constituent isolated directly from, an herb or other botanical; or

''(cc) a combination of 2 or more substances described in item (aa) or (bb);

''(II) is a dietary ingredient for purposes of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 301 et seq.); and

''(III) is not anabolic or androgenic.

''(iii) In accordance with section 515(a), any person claiming the benefit of an exemption or exception under clause (ii) shall bear the burden of going forward with the evidence with respect to such exemption or exception.''.

(b) CLASSIFICATION AUTHORITY.—Section 201 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 811) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(i) TEMPORARY AND PERMANENT SCHEDULING OF RECENTLY EMERGED ANABOLIC STEROIDS.—

''(1) The Attorney General may issue a temporary order adding a drug or other substance to the definition of anabolic steroids if the Attorney General finds that—

''(A) the drug or other substance satisfies the criteria for being considered an anabolic steroid under section 102(41) but is not listed in that section or by regulation of the Attorney General as being an anabolic steroid; and

''(B) adding such drug or other substance to the definition of anabolic steroids will assist in preventing abuse or misuse of the drug or other substance.

''(2) An order issued under paragraph (1) shall not take effect until 30 days after the date of the publication by the Attorney General of a notice in the Federal Register of the intention to issue such order and the grounds upon which such order is to be issued. The order shall expire not later than 24 months after the date it becomes effective, except that the Attorney General may, during the pendency of proceedings under paragraph (6), extend the temporary scheduling order for up to 6 months.

''(3) The Attorney General shall transmit notice of an order proposed to be issued under paragraph (1) to the Secretary of Health and Human Services. In issuing an order under paragraph (1), the Attorney General shall take into consideration any comments submitted by the Secretary in response to a notice transmitted pursuant to this paragraph.

''(4) A temporary scheduling order issued under paragraph (1) shall be vacated upon the issuance of a permanent scheduling order under paragraph (6).

''(5) An order issued under paragraph (1) is not subject to judicial review.

''(6) The Attorney General may, by rule, issue a permanent order adding a drug or other substance to the definition of anabolic steroids if such drug or other substance satisfies the criteria for being considered an anabolic steroid under section 102(41). Such rulemaking may be commenced simultaneously with the issuance of the temporary order issued under paragraph (1).''.

SEC. 3. LABELING REQUIREMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 305 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 825) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(e) FALSE LABELING OF ANABOLIC STEROIDS.—

''(1) It shall be unlawful to import, export, manufacture, distribute, dispense, or possess with intent to manufacture, distribute, or dispense, an anabolic steroid or product containing an anabolic steroid, unless the steroid or product bears a label clearly identifying an anabolic steroid or product containing an anabolic steroid by the nomenclature used by the International Union of Pure and Applied Chemistry (IUPAC).

''(2)(A) A product described in subparagraph (B) is exempt from the International Union of Pure and Applied Chemistry nomenclature requirement of this subsection if such product is labeled in the manner required under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act.

''(B) A product is described in this subparagraph if the product—

''(i) is the subject of an approved application as described in section 505(b) or (j) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act; or

''(ii) is exempt from the provisions of section 505 of such Act relating to new drugs because—

''(I) it is intended solely for investigational use as described in section 505(i) of such Act; and

''(II) such product is being used exclusively for purposes of a clinical trial that is the subject of an effective investigational new drug application.''.

(b) CLARIFICATION TO IMPORT AND EXPORT STATUTE.—Section 1010 of the Controlled Substances Import and Export Act (21 U.S.C. 960) is amended, in subsection (a)(1), by inserting ''305,'' before ''1002''.

(c) CIVIL PENALTIES.—Section 402 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 842) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (14), by striking ''or'' at the end;

(B) in paragraph (15), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; or''; and

(C) by inserting, after paragraph (15), the following:

''(16) to violate subsection (e) of section 825 of this title.''; and

(2) in subsection (c)(1)—

(A) by inserting, in subparagraph (A), after ''subparagraph (B)'' the following: '', (C), or (D)''; and

(B) by inserting after subparagraph (B) the following:

''(C) In the case of a violation of paragraph (16) of subsection (a) of this section by an importer, exporter, manufacturer, or distributor (other than as provided in subparagraph (D)), up to $500,000 per violation. For purposes of this subparagraph, a violation is defined as each instance of importation, exportation, manufacturing, distribution, or possession with intent to manufacture or distribute, in violation of paragraph (16) of subsection (a).

''(D) In the case of a distribution, dispensing, or possession with intent to distribute or dispense in violation of paragraph (16) of subsection (a) of this section at the retail level, up to $1000 per violation. For purposes of this paragraph, the term 'at the retail level' refers to products sold, or held for sale, directly to the consumer for personal use. Each package, container or other separate unit containing an anabolic steroid that is distributed, dispensed, or possessed with intent to distribute or dispense at the retail level in violation of such paragraph (16) of subsection (a) shall be considered a separate violation.''.

SEC. 4. IDENTIFICATION AND PUBLICATION OF LIST OF PRODUCTS CONTAINING ANABOLIC STEROIDS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General may, in the Attorney General's discretion, collect data and analyze products to determine whether they contain anabolic steroids and are properly labeled in accordance with this Act and the amendments made by this Act. The Attorney General may publish in the Federal Register or on the website of the Drug Enforcement Administration a list of products which the Attorney General has determined, based on substantial evidence, contain an anabolic steroid and are not labeled in accordance with this Act and the amendments made by this Act.

(b) ABSENCE FROM LIST.—The absence of a product from the list referred to in subsection (a) shall not constitute evidence that the product does not contain an anabolic steroid.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS) and the gentlewoman from the Virginia Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to insert extraneous materials into the RECORD on the bill.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, the Health Subcommittee ranking member, FRANK PALLONE, and I introduced H.R. 4771, the Designer Anabolic Steroid Control Act, DASCA, to end a loophole that allows designer anabolic steroids to easily be found online, in gyms, and even in retail stores.

When taken by consumers, designer steroids, which are class III controlled substances, can cause serious medical harm, including liver injury, increased risk of heart attack, and stroke. They may also lead to aggression, hostility, and addiction.

Designer steroids are produced by reverse engineering existing illegal steroids and then slightly modifying their chemical composition so the resulting product is not on the DEA's list of controlled substances.

DASCA will help protect consumers from these harmful products by giving the DEA the tools and authority to properly classify designer steroids as controlled substances and increase criminal penalties for importing, manufacturing, or distributing them under false labels.

DASCA would:

Immediately place a number of known designer anabolic steroids on the list of controlled substances;

Grant the DEA authority to temporarily schedule new designer steroids on the controlled substances list for 24 months, with the possibility of a 6-month extension so that if bad actors develop new variations, these products can be removed from the market immediately;

Create new penalties for importing, manufacturing, or distributing anabolic steroids under false labels; and

Authorize the Attorney General to publish a list of products containing an anabolic steroid that are not properly labeled.

DASCA is supported by the American Herbal Products Association, AHPA; the Consumer Healthcare Products Association, CHPA; the Council for Responsible Nutrition, CRN; the Natural Products Association, NPA; and the United Natural Products Alliance, UNPA.

I would urge all Members to support this critical piece of legislation. It is bipartisan. I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4771, the Designer Anabolic Steroid Control Act of 2014.

H.R. 4771 would amend the Controlled Substances Act to expand the definition of ''anabolic steroids'' to include 25 additional chemicals, thereby facilitating their control by the Drug Enforcement Agency. The CSA contains a list of chemicals defined as anabolic steroids. However, chemists, as you have heard, are able to design around the list, creating new anabolic steroids that are not on the CSA list. The DEA, therefore, has a more difficult time making enforcement actions against people using them.

The bill will also make it easier for the Drug Enforcement Agency to add subsequent designer chemicals to the list of anabolic steroids and increases civil and criminal penalties for offenses pertaining to anabolic steroids.

Anabolic steroids are synthetic variants of the male sex hormone testosterone. They have a number of therapeutic uses but are also used by muscle builders and athletes to improve performance. Long-term or high-dosage use can cause adverse health effects, including damage to the liver and heart, and testicular atrophy.

H.R. 4771 will go a long way toward removing dangerous steroids from the market. We have seen the harm these drugs have caused, particularly in our youth and in professional sports, particularly baseball. The bill will give DEA an important tool to fight the use of hard-to-detect designer steroids.

I want to commend Chairman JOE PITTS and Ranking Member FRANK PALLONE for their sponsorship of this bipartisan legislation.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting today's legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support this bipartisan legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support passage of the Designer Anabolic Steroid Control Act of 2014.

This legislation will amend the Controlled Substances Act, the CSA, to include 25 additional chemicals as anabolic steroids It also will make it easier for the Drug Enforcement Agency, DEA, to add additional chemicals to the CSA list of anabolic steroids. And it increases civil and criminal penalties for offenses pertaining to anabolic steroids.

Anabolic steroids have legitimate therapeutic uses, but they also can cause severe adverse effects when used inappropriately. I have been concerned for many years about the harms they have caused in young people and professional athletes, who take them to improve athletic and body building performance.

One challenge our nation has faced in stopping steroid abuse is that chemists are continually finding ways to design new versions of these drugs that can escape detection or evade the law. This bill helps address this problem. It will give DEA new tools to control the abuse of designer steroids and will help get them off the market.

I commend Chairman JOE PITTS and Ranking Member FRANK PALLONE for their sponsorship of this bipartisan legislation.

I urge all members to support it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4771, 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.

EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES FOR CHILDREN REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2014

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 2154) to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize the Emergency Medical Services for Children Program.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 2154

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 ''Emergency Medical Services for Children Reauthorization Act of 2014''.

SEC. 2. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 1910(d) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300w–9(d)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''and $30,387,656'' and inserting ''$30,387,656''; and

(2) by inserting before the period '', and $20,213,000 for each of fiscal years 2015 through 2019''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS) and the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to insert extraneous materials into the RECORD on the bill.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 2154, the Emergency Medical Services for Children Reauthorization Act of 2014, introduced by Senator CASEY of Pennsylvania and Senator HATCH of Utah and championed in the House by Mr. MATHESON of Utah and Mr. KING of New York.

A child's health care necessities are not the same as their parents. Children have special health care needs, and the emergency and trauma care system has been slow to develop an adequate response. Fragmentation and poor coordination among pre-hospital services, hospitals, and public health are problems that involve emergency services in general. The gravity of the problem is worse for children when hospitals lack the appropriate medical personnel, pediatric supplies, or transfer agreements that lead to better care within the ''golden hour,'' when chances for survival are higher.

In 1984, Congress passed the Emergency Medical Services for Children, EMSC, as part of the Preventive Health Amendments of 1984. The program was last reauthorized in 2010 and aims to reduce child and youth mortality and morbidity caused by severe illness or trauma. EMSC was designed to ensure that pediatric service is well integrated into an emergency medical service system and that the entire spectrum of emergency services is provided to children and adolescents, as well as adults.

The bill is almost identical to H.R. 4290, which the House passed last week. Voting for S. 2154 would send the bill to the President so we can continue this important program that helps our Nation's children.

I ask my colleagues to vote for this important piece of legislation, which is bipartisan, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of S. 2154, the Emergency Medical Services for Children Reauthorization Act of 2014.

Established 30 years ago this year, the Emergency Medical Services for Children program has supported improvements to pediatric emergency care in all U.S. States, territories, and freely associated States. EMSC grant programs help assess emergency systems and implement quality improvement measures, improve services in

rural and tribal communities, and support a research network that facilitates studies in pediatric emergency care.

Last week, as the chairman said, the House approved a similar bill to reauthorize the Emergency Medical Services for Children program by voice vote. By advancing the Senate's companion legislation today, the EMSC program will be able to continue for another 5 years at its currently appropriated funding level.

I want to thank Senators HATCH and CASEY for sponsoring this bill in the Senate, Congressmen MATHESON and KING for sponsoring the House companion bill, and leaders on the Energy and Commerce Committee and the Senate Health, Education, Labor and Pensions Committee for making it possible to have a consensus bill before us today—Chairman UPTON, Chairman PITTS, Ranking Member WAXMAN, Ranking Member PALLONE, Chairman HARKIN, and Ranking Member ALEXANDER.

I urge Members to support S. 2154 so we can send this bill to the President for his signature.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support this bipartisan legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 2154, the Emergency Medical Services for Children Reauthorization Act of 2014.

The Emergency Medical Services for Children (EMSC) program aims to reduce the number of deaths of children and adolescents due to severe illness or trauma. This program supports a number of grant programs to advance pediatric emergency care. It is the only federal program that specifically focuses on improving emergency services for children and adolescents.

The House of Representatives approved legislation reauthorizing the EMSC program last week. The Senate bill before us today reauthorizes the program for another five years at the level of funding it received in fiscal year 2014.

I want to commend the sponsors of this bill and of the House companion legislation—Senators CASEY and HATCH and Congressmen MATHESON and KING—for their leadership on this issue. I would also like to thank Chairman UPTON, Chairman PITTS, and Ranking Member PALLONE for their work on this legislation in the Energy and Commerce Committee, and Chairman HARKIN and Ranking Member ALEXANDER for their work in the Senate Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee.

I support S. 2154 and urge my colleagues to do the same.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 2154.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. PITTS. 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 motion will be postponed.

INSULAR AREAS AND FREELY ASSOCIATED STATES ENERGY DEVELOPMENT

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 83) to require the Secretary of the Interior to assemble a team of technical, policy, and financial experts to address the energy needs of the insular areas of the United States and the Freely Associated States through the development of action plans aimed at reducing reliance on imported fossil fuels and increasing use of indigenous clean-energy resources, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 83

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

SECTION 1. INSULAR AREAS AND FREELY ASSOCIATED STATES ENERGY DEVELOPMENT.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) COMPREHENSIVE ENERGY PLAN.—The term ''comprehensive energy plan'' means a comprehensive energy plan prepared and updated under subsections (c) and (e) of section 604 of the Act entitled ''An Act to authorize appropriations for certain insular areas of the United States, and for other purposes'', approved December 24, 1980 (48 U.S.C. 1492).

(2) ENERGY ACTION PLAN.—The term ''energy action plan'' means the plan required by subsection (d).

(3) FREELY ASSOCIATED STATES.—The term ''Freely Associated States'' means the Federated States of Micronesia, the Republic of the Marshall Islands, and the Republic of Palau.

(4) INSULAR AREAS.—The term ''insular areas'' means American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Virgin Islands.

(5) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Interior.

(6) TEAM.—The term ''team'' means the team established by the Secretary under subsection (b).

(b) ESTABLISHMENT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall establish a team of technical, policy, and financial experts—

(1) to develop energy action plans addressing the immediate, near-term, and long-term energy and environmental needs of each of the insular areas and Freely Associated States; and

(2) to assist each of the insular areas and Freely Associated States in implementing an energy action plan.

(c) PARTICIPATION OF REGIONAL UTILITY ORGANIZATIONS.—In establishing the team, the Secretary shall consider including regional utility organizations.

(d) ENERGY ACTION PLANS.—In accordance with subsection (b), the energy action plans shall include—

(1) recommendations, based on the comprehensive energy plan where applicable, to—

(A) promote access to affordable, reliable energy;

(B) develop indigenous, nonfossil fuel energy resources; and

(C) improve performance of energy infrastructure and overall energy efficiency;

(2) a schedule for implementation of such recommendations and identification and prioritization of specific projects;

(3) a financial and engineering plan for implementing and sustaining projects; and

(4) benchmarks for measuring progress toward implementation.

(e) REPORTS TO SECRETARY.—Not later than 1 year after the date on which the Secretary establishes the team and annually thereafter, the team shall submit to the Secretary a report detailing progress made in fulfilling its charge and in implementing the energy action plans.

(f) ANNUAL REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 30 days after the date on which the Secretary receives a report submitted by the team under subsection (e), the Secretary shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a summary of the report of the team.

(g) FUNDING.—No additional funds are authorized to be appropriated for the purpose of carrying out this section, and this section shall be carried out using amounts otherwise available for such purpose.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD) and the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to insert extraneous material in the RECORD on the bill.

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

There was no objection.

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

I would like to include an exchange of letters between the Committee on Energy and Commerce and the Committee on Natural Resources.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES,
Washington, DC, June 19, 2014.

Hon. FRED UPTON,
Chairman, Committee on Energy and Commerce, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I write in regard to H.R. 83. As you are aware, the bill was primarily referred to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, but the Committee on Natural Resources has a jurisdictional interest in the bill and has requested a sequential referral.

I recognize and appreciate your desire to bring this legislation before the House in an expeditious manner, and, accordingly, I agree not to insist on a referral of H.R. 83. I do so with the understanding that by foregoing such a referral, the Committee on Natural Resources does not waive any future jurisdictional claim on this or similar matters. Further, the Committee on Natural Resources reserves the right to seek the appointment of conferees, if it should become necessary.

I ask that you insert a copy of our exchange of letters into the Congressional Record during consideration of this measure on the House floor.

Thank you for your courtesy in this matter and I look forward to continued cooperation between our respective committees.

Sincerely,

DOC HASTINGS,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE,
Washington, DC, June 20, 2014.

Hon. DOC HASTINGS,
Chairman, Committee on Natural Resources, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN HASTINGS, Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 83, to require the Secretary of the Interior to assemble a team of technical, policy, and financial experts to address the energy needs of the insular areas of the United States and the Freely Associated States through the development of action plans aimed at reducing reliance on imported fossil fuels and increasing use of indigenous clean-energy resources, and for other purposes. As you noted, H.R. 83 was referred to both the Committee on Energy and Commerce and the Committee on Natural Resources.

I appreciate your willingness to discharge the H.R. 83 from further consideration by the Committee on Natural Resources so that it may proceed expeditiously to the House floor for consideration.

I agree that by discharging the bill, the Committee on Natural Resources does not waive any future jurisdictional claim on this or similar matters. Further, I agree that the Committee on Natural Resources preserves its right to seek the appointment of conferees, if it should become necessary.

Finally, I would be pleased to insert a copy of our exchange into the Congressional Record during consideration of this measure on the House floor.

Thank you again for your assistance with this matter.

Sincerely,

FRED UPTON,
Chairman.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I want to thank Dr. CHRISTENSEN for being the primary author of this important legislation.

H.R. 83 requires the Secretary of the Interior to assemble a team of technical, policy, and financial experts to address the energy needs of the insular areas of the United States and the freely associated states of Guam, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands through the development of energy action plans aimed at promoting access to affordable and reliable energy.

□ 1615

These U.S. territories have few conventional energy resources, and they are dependent upon imports to meet a significant portion of their energy needs. As a result the resident of those areas pay unusually high electricity bills. In addition, because these areas are isolated from areas that provide their energy fuels, as well as the added cost of transporting these fuels, they face higher energy costs and greater threat of supply interruption than areas that are energy independent or have a more convenient source of energy fuels.

Dr. CHRISTENSEN has done a great job of bringing to the attention of our committee the unique challenges faced in those areas. H.R. 83 will assist these important U.S. territories in addressing their energy needs by establishing a team of energy experts to help develop and implement an energy action plan for each of these areas.

Congress certainly has an ongoing interest in the energy needs of the Nation, as well as the insular areas of the U.S. and the freely associated states. Helping these territories develop affordable and reliable sources of energy are hallmarks of a thriving economy that can improve the quality of life for all.

H.R. 83 will not entirely solve these issues, but it will help facilitate the efforts.

I would urge all Members to support this legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I rise in very strong support of H.R. 83, a bill which I introduced on the very first day of this Congress. This legislation, as you have heard, would require the Secretary of the Interior to assemble a team of technical, policy, and financial experts to address our energy needs through the development of action plans to promote access to affordable, reliable energy all while increasing the use of indigenous clean-energy resources in the insular areas of American Samoa, the Northern Mariana Islands, Puerto Rico, Guam, the Virgin Islands, and the freely associated states.

Before I go any further, I want to take this opportunity to thank Subcommittee Chairman WHITFIELD and Ranking Member RUSH and Committee Chairman UPTON and Ranking Member WAXMAN who, on hearing the high cost of electricity in my district, the U.S. Virgin Islands, immediately offered to support my efforts to bring relief.

I recall the very first time I shared how much we paid for electricity during one of our earlier Energy and Power Subcommittee meetings. Chairman WHITFIELD actually followed me outside of the room to confirm that he had heard the right figure and then pledged to do whatever he could as chairman to help on this issue.

We thank you for your help and your support. With their support Energy and Commerce actually passed this bill in July of last year, and we have been trying to bring it to the floor for passage since then.

I also want to thank Natural Resources Chair DOC HASTINGS and Ranking Member DEFAZIO for releasing the bill from their jurisdiction so that we could bring it to the floor today.

We have come a long way since 2008 when the Subcommittee on Insular Affairs, which I chaired at that time, and the Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources, chaired then by Congressman JIM COSTA, held an official hearing in Frederiksted, St. Croix, U.S. Virgin Islands.

Its specific purpose was to highlight the high cost of energy in the Virgin Islands and other territories and to explore and offer alternative and renewable sources. It was at that hearing that we first called for a project like the Energy Development for Island Nations which then only existed in Hawaii.

Within a year the Department of the Interior and the Governor brought this project to the Virgin Islands. This initiative is what assisted our water and power authority to plan and implement the transition to propane and solar which will begin to lower costs later this year or earlier next year. It has also prepared the way for wind energy.

Today EDIN is no more, and we still have miles to go before we can see the significant reductions in cost that our families and our businesses must bear, and that is why we are here asking this body to pass H.R. 83 today.

This measure will help my district and our Nation's other insular areas become less reliant on expensive foreign-imported fuel and address our longstanding energy challenges which have become increasingly complicated by price shocks and instability in the oil markets over the past few years.

The bill requires that the energy action plans identify and offer remedies to our immediate, near-term, long-term, and environmental needs along with recommendations on how to improve the performance of energy infrastructure, how to improve overall energy efficiency, and how to set a schedule for implementation of those recommendations.

Just to give you a little more context to our ongoing dilemma, on every occasion when I am in my district, I hear business owners tell me that they are not sure how much longer they can hold on before closing. In fact, many have closed, and the high electricity costs make it very difficult to attract new ones at a time when our economy needs the stimulus.

At one social event I recall a mother of five pleading with me to keep seeking help as her almost $500 a month bill is making it difficult for her to provide for the needs of her family. Our seniors are foregoing medicine and basic essentials. Many are living in darkness.

In some communities it would appear as though many have moved away when in actuality they are simply turning to candles and kerosene lamps because they simply cannot afford to turn on the lights. This presents risks to health and safety that are just unacceptable.

According to the Energy Information Administration, the national average cost of energy is 9.94 cents per kilowatt hour in the United States. Residential ratepayers in my district pay around 51.2 cents per kilowatt hour while commercial ratepayers incur a charge of approximately 54.3 cents.

This is nearly 500 times the national average, a cost that is unsustainable and crippling to our economy and the health and safety of our families. Residents in other territories and the State

of Hawaii pay rates that vary from 26 cents in Puerto Rico to over 40 cents in the smaller islands of Hawaii, costs which are still unacceptable and unsustainably high.

Despite our challenges and obstacles, our territories are steadfastly working to identify opportunities to adopt a diverse portfolio of energy options. This bill remains extremely necessary to support us in those endeavors because it recognizes the need for immediate short-term action.

H.R. 83 also recognizes the crisis that the current 30th legislature of the Virgin Islands has declared for energy in our territory and directs focus to the short-term needs of our community as well as to ensuring that, when the transactions are made, we will be putting together the right mix of fuel sources that will provide the most efficient electricity at the lowest possible cost.

As all of these factors converge, we know there is no better time than the present to aggressively pursue the deployment of solar, wind, LNG, LPG, geothermal, ocean wave, and thermal energy as well as storage systems. I am encouraged that this can be made a reality with the guidance of a team of experts dedicated solely to mitigating and resolving these issues.

Given our geographic locations, we don't have the privilege of tapping into nearby grid systems in times of crisis. This bill will arm us with the tools necessary to help us to transition along with the rest of our country to resources that are much more affordable, reliable, efficient, and clean.

President Obama has led the way. Many States have enacted strong energy plans that chart a way forward. Considering all of the options available to them, it is only fair that our territories also join in the race for energy independence and clean energy leadership.

On behalf of my district and all of the other territories and insular areas, I would like to also thank the Democratic leadership for helping me with H.R. 83, a bill that is critically important to the energy future of the U.S. Virgin Islands and all of our Nation's territories and freely associated states.

I also want to thank my colleagues for their support as we work through these challenges and issues. My constituents are encouraged and heartened by the support that we have received thus far.

I ask all of my colleagues to support the passage of H.R. 83, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I would once again urge everyone to support H.R. 83. I want to thank Chairman UPTON and Ranking Member WAXMAN and staff on both sides of the aisle for working to bring this important legislation to the floor. I urge its passage, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PIERLUISI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 83, and commend my colleague, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, for her leadership in sponsoring this legislation. I am a cosponsor of this bill, and want to express my support for its passage by the full House of Representatives. The bill requires the Secretary of the Interior to establish a team of experts to develop, and help implement, a plan for each territory to reduce reliance on imported oil and to transition to cleaner energy sources that will improve the environment and lower electricity costs.

A typical territory resident pays two to four times more for electricity than the U.S. national average. As an island that does not produce oil, coal or natural gas, Puerto Rico faces inherent energy challenges. Notwithstanding the progress that was made under the last administration in San Juan, which oversaw a nearly 15 percent increase in the use of natural gas and a doubling of the use of renewable sources, Puerto Rico still generates most of its electricity from imported oil.

Burning oil pollutes the air and explains why Puerto Rico has the highest rate of asthma and other respiratory illnesses in the nation. Oil is expensive and subject to sudden price shocks. The high cost of electricity strains family budgets and harms businesses.

The plan called for by H.R. 83 will help the governments of Puerto Rico and the other territories diversify their energy portfolios and reduce electricity rates. It is for these reasons that I urge passage of this bill. I thank the Chairman and Ranking Member of the House Committee on Energy and Commerce for working with us to advance this bill.

Mr. SABLAN. Mr. Speaker, lowering the cost of electricity is extremely important to the people I represent in the Northern Mariana Islands. Residential customers in my district pay 40 cents per kilowatt-hour—three times the U.S. average. And those electricity bills are eating away at families' paychecks.

That's why I support H.R. 83.

H.R. 83 will help local governments develop and implement plans to reduce reliance on the expensive fossil fuels that make electricity so expensive in America's insular areas, including the Northern Mariana Islands.

The plans will propose technical, financial, and policy actions that island governments and local utilities can take to move the islands towards alternative sources of energy—especially renewables. The plans will show how to improve efficiency beginning with production, through distribution, and at the point of use, so that every kilowatt generated in the islands goes unwasted.

Last year, Congresswomen DONNA CHRISTENSEN and MADELEINE BORDALLO, Congressman ENI FALEOMAVAEGA, Resident Commissioner PEDRO PIERLUISI and I were successful in convincing Health and Human Services Secretary Kathleen Sebelius to increase funding for the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program in our islands. About 120 families were added to the rolls in the Northern Marianas and the assistance that all 420 families now receive is as much as double the previous amount.

But helping some families with the high cost of energy is only a partial fix. We need to lower costs for everyone. That's what Ms. CHRISTENSEN's bill promises to do.

I want to thank Congresswoman CHRISTENSEN for her years of work to move this important bill forward and congratulate her for bringing the bill to the floor today.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R 83.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 83 to require the Secretary of the Interior to assemble a team of technical, policy, and financial experts to address the energy needs of the insular areas of the United States and the Freely Associated States through the development of action plans aimed at reducing reliance on imported fossil fuels and increasing use of indigenous clean energy resources, and for other purposes.

This bill was introduced by my good friend, Congresswoman DONNA CHRISTENSEN, and I thank her for her leadership. I also commend my fellow Territorial Delegates for their support. I am proud to be an original cosponsor, and I commend Chairman FRED UPTON and Ranking Member HENRY WAXMAN of the Committee on Energy and Commerce for bringing this legislation to the floor today.

H.R. 83 is critical in order to provide a comprehensive approach in addressing the high cost of energy in our island Territories and in the Freely Associated States. Given our remote locations, we rely solely on imported fuel has an adverse effect on our local economies.

As discussed at 3rd International Conference of Small Island Developing States that was held in Apia, Samoa a few weeks ago, we should also be concerned about the effects of climate change on our communities. It is crucial that we develop action plans aimed at reducing our reliance on imported fossil fuels.

H.R. 83 is an important first step in addressing our challenges and I urge my colleagues to support and pass H.R. 83.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 83, as amended.

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

The title was amended so as to read: ''A bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to assemble a team of technical, policy, and financial experts to address the energy needs of the insular areas of the United States and the Freely Associated States through the development of energy action plans aimed at promoting access to affordable, reliable energy, including increasing use of indigenous clean-energy resources, and for other purposes.''.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1630

TRANSFER OF YELLOW CREEK PORT PROPERTIES

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3044) to approve the transfer of Yellow Creek Port properties in Iuka, Mississippi.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3044

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

SECTION 1. TRANSFER OF YELLOW CREEK PORT PROPERTIES.

In accordance with section 4(k) of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933 (16

U.S.C. 831c(k)), Congress approves the conveyance by the Tennessee Valley Authority, on behalf of the United States, to the State of Mississippi of the Yellow Creek Port properties owned by the United States and in the custody of the Authority at Iuka, Mississippi, as of the date of enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. CRAWFORD) and the gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CRAWFORD. 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. 3044.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, the Tennessee Valley Authority was created by Congress in 1933 to provide wholesale electric power and create economic development opportunities for those States in the Tennessee Valley region.

The State of Mississippi initiated development of Yellow Creek Port in 1971 on 116 acres purchased from the TVA. Industrial growth, high-paying jobs, associated spinoff companies, and increased traffic on the Nation's inland waterway system have occurred because of the development of Yellow Creek Port.

I would like to thank Congressman ALAN NUNNELEE for introducing H.R. 3044, legislation that will convey land from TVA to the State of Mississippi to provide economic development opportunities in the region. Nunnelee has been a leader on these types of activities since he was elected to Congress in 2010.

The land being conveyed through this legislation will be used solely for industrial purposes and allow the State of Mississippi to expand the Yellow Creek Port to meet increasing demand.

H.R. 3044 will execute the conveyance of the remaining 173 acres of property from TVA to the State of Mississippi to complete the development of Yellow Creek Port and fulfill one of TVA's missions of ensuring economic development opportunities in the TVA service area.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support H.R. 3044, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

H.R. 3044 will allow the transfer of 173 acres of Tennessee Valley Authority lands to the State of Mississippi for industrial and economic development.

The Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933 withdrew lands from the Tennessee River System to provide for future development of power plants, industrial sites, ports, and supporting infrastructure.

In 1971 at the confluence of the Tennessee and the Tombigbee Rivers, the Yellow Creek Port project was initiated. The purpose of the Yellow Creek Port project was to support economic development and local jobs in northeast Mississippi. The TVA and the State of Mississippi have jointly supported the development and growth of the port.

TVA initially transferred 289 acres of land to the Yellow Creek Port to facilitate development back in 1971. H.R. 3044 would transfer an additional 173 acres of the land to the State of Mississippi.

The acreage includes industrial, highway, and railroad easements and 54 acres of undeveloped land. The TVA has attempted to sell this land since 1984, with no interested buyers.

Mr. Speaker, the TVA Act allows TVA, with appropriate congressional approvals, to dispose of property for particular uses. According to TVA, the agency places reversionary interest clauses in transfers and sales to ensure that those uses specified by Congress in the TVA Act are carried out. TVA then retains the right to retake possession of the property if the use condition is breached.

In February the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee considered and passed S. 212, by a voice vote, which supported the transfer of these same 173 acres. The Congressional Budget Office has concluded that the net impact of the transfer would be insignificant and would not affect direct spending. TVA has confirmed that the transferred lands would be used for industrial development; and again, if for some reason the lands are instead proposed for some nonindustrial purpose, the TVA can legally have the lands returned to them.

Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of any opposition to H.R. 3044, and as we have heard, the construction of the Yellow Creek Port in 1971 initially involved approximately 289 acres.

So with that, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support the passage of H.R. 3044.

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

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Maryland for her support. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this important legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. CRAWFORD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3044.

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.

CHILD CARE AND DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT ACT OF 2014

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 1086) to reauthorize and improve the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 1086

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 ''Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 2014''.

SEC. 2. SHORT TITLE AND PURPOSES.

Section 658A of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 9801 note) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 658A. SHORT TITLE AND PURPOSES.

''(a) SHORT TITLE.—This subchapter may be cited as the 'Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990'.

''(b) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this subchapter are—

''(1) to allow each State maximum flexibility in developing child care programs and policies that best suit the needs of children and parents within that State;

''(2) to promote parental choice to empower working parents to make their own decisions regarding the child care services that best suit their family's needs;

''(3) to encourage States to provide consumer education information to help parents make informed choices about child care services and to promote involvement by parents and family members in the development of their children in child care settings;

''(4) to assist States in delivering high-quality, coordinated early childhood care and education services to maximize parents' options and support parents trying to achieve independence from public assistance;

''(5) to assist States in improving the overall quality of child care services and programs by implementing the health, safety, licensing, training, and oversight standards established in this subchapter and in State law (including State regulations);

''(6) to improve child care and development of participating children; and

''(7) to increase the number and percentage of low-income children in high-quality child care settings.''.

SEC. 3. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 658B of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 9858) is amended by striking ''subchapter'' and all that follows through the period at the end, and inserting ''subchapter $2,360,000,000 for fiscal year 2015, $2,478,000,000 for fiscal year 2016, $2,539,950,000 for fiscal year 2017, $2,603,448,750 for fiscal year 2018, $2,668,534,969 for fiscal year 2019, and $2,748,591,018 for fiscal year 2020.''.

SEC. 4. LEAD AGENCY.

(a) DESIGNATION.—Section 658D(a) of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 9858b(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''chief executive officer'' and inserting ''Governor''; and

(2) by striking ''designate'' and all that follows and inserting ''designate an agency (which may be an appropriate collaborative agency), or establish a joint interagency office, that complies with the requirements of subsection (b) to serve as the lead agency for the State under this subchapter.''.

(b) COLLABORATION WITH TRIBES.—Section 658D(b)(1) of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 9858b(b)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (C), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (D), by striking the period and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(E) at the option of an Indian tribe or tribal organization in the State, collaborate and coordinate with such Indian tribe or tribal organization in the development of the State plan in a timely manner.''.

SEC. 5. APPLICATION AND PLAN.

(a) PERIOD.—Section 658E(b) of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 9858c(b)) is amended by striking ''2-year'' and inserting ''3-year''.

(b) POLICIES AND PROCEDURES.—Section 658E(c) of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 9858c(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by inserting ''or established'' after ''designated'';

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in subparagraph (B), by inserting a comma after ''care of such providers'';

(B) by striking subparagraphs (D) through (H); and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(D) MONITORING AND INSPECTION REPORTS.—The plan shall include a certification that the State, not later than 1 year after the State has in effect the policies and practices described in subparagraph (K)(i), will make public by electronic means, in a consumer-friendly and easily accessible format, organized by provider, the results of monitoring and inspection reports, including those due to major substantiated complaints about failure to comply with this subchapter and State child care policies, as well as the number of deaths, serious injuries, and instances of substantiated child abuse that occurred in child care settings each year, for eligible child care providers within the State. The results shall also include information on the date of such an inspection, and, where applicable, information on corrective action taken.

''(E) CONSUMER AND PROVIDER EDUCATION INFORMATION.—The plan shall include a certification that the State will collect and disseminate (which dissemination may be done, except as otherwise specified in this subparagraph, through resource and referral organizations or other means as determined by the State) to parents of eligible children, the general public, and, where applicable, providers—

''(i) information about the availability of the full diversity of child care services that will promote informed child care choices and that concerns—

''(I) the availability of child care services provided through programs authorized by this subchapter and, if feasible, other child care services and other programs provided in the State for which the family may be eligible, as well as the availability of financial assistance to obtain child care services in the State;

''(II) if available, information about the quality of providers, as determined by the State, that can be provided through a Quality Rating and Improvement System;

''(III) information, made available through a State Web site, describing the State process for licensing child care providers, the State processes for conducting background checks, and monitoring and inspections, of child care providers, and the offenses that prevent individuals and entities from serving as child care providers in the State;

''(IV) other programs for which families that receive child care services for which financial assistance is provided under this subchapter may be eligible, including the program of block grants to States for temporary assistance for needy families established under part A of title IV of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 601 et seq.), Head Start and Early Head Start programs carried out under the Head Start Act (42 U.S.C. 9831 et seq.), the program carried out under the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Act of 1981 (42 U.S.C. 8621 et seq.), the supplemental nutrition assistance program established under the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2011 et seq.), the special supplemental nutrition program for women, infants, and children established under section 17 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1786), the child and adult care food program established under section 17 of the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1766), and the Medicaid and State children's health insurance programs under titles XIX and XXI of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396 et seq., 1397aa et seq.);

''(V) programs carried out under section 619 and part C of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1419, 1431 et seq.);

''(VI) research and best practices concerning children's development, including social and emotional development, early childhood development, and meaningful parent and family engagement, and physical health and development (particularly healthy eating and physical activity); and

''(VII) the State policies regarding the social-emotional behavioral health of young children, which may include positive behavioral intervention and support models, and policies on expulsion of preschool-aged children, in early childhood programs receiving assistance under this subchapter; and

''(ii) information on developmental screenings, including—

''(I) information on existing (as of the date of submission of the application containing the plan) resources and services the State can deploy, including the coordinated use of the Early and Periodic Screening, Diagnosis, and Treatment program under the Medicaid program carried out under title XIX of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396 et seq.) and developmental screening services available under section 619 and part C of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1419, 1431 et seq.), in conducting developmental screenings and providing referrals to services, when appropriate, for children who receive assistance under this subchapter; and

''(II) a description of how a family or eligible child care provider may utilize the resources and services described in subclause (I) to obtain developmental screenings for children who receive assistance under this subchapter who may be at risk for cognitive or other developmental delays, which may include social, emotional, physical, or linguistic delays.

''(F) COMPLIANCE WITH STATE LICENSING REQUIREMENTS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The plan shall include a certification that the State involved has in effect licensing requirements applicable to child care services provided within the State, and provide a detailed description of such requirements and of how such requirements are effectively enforced.

''(ii) LICENSE EXEMPTION.—If the State uses funds received under this subchapter to support a child care provider that is exempt from the corresponding licensing requirements described in clause (i), the plan shall include a description stating why such licensing exemption does not endanger the health, safety, or development of children who receive services from child care providers who are exempt from such requirements.

''(G) TRAINING AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT REQUIREMENTS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The plan shall describe the training and professional development requirements that are in effect within the State designed to enable child care providers to promote the social, emotional, physical, and cognitive development of children and to improve the knowledge and skills of the child care workforce. Such requirements shall be applicable to child care providers that provide services for which assistance is provided in accordance with this subchapter.

''(ii) REQUIREMENTS.—The plan shall provide an assurance that such training and professional development—

''(I) shall be conducted on an ongoing basis, provide for a progression of professional development (which may include encouraging the pursuit of postsecondary education), reflect current research and best practices relating to the skills necessary for the child care workforce to meet the developmental needs of participating children, and improve the quality of, and stability within, the child care workforce;

''(II) shall be developed in consultation with the State Advisory Council on Early Childhood Education and Care (designated or established pursuant to section 642B(b)(1)(A)(i) of the Head Start Act (42 U.S.C. 9837b(b)(1)(A)(i))), and may engage training providers in aligning training opportunities with the State's training framework;

''(III) incorporates knowledge and application of the State's early learning and developmental guidelines (where applicable), the State's health and safety standards, and incorporates social-emotional behavior intervention models, which may include positive behavior intervention and support models;

''(IV) shall be accessible to providers supported through Indian tribes or tribal organizations that receive assistance under this subchapter; and

''(V) to the extent practicable, are appropriate for a population of children that includes—

''(aa) different age groups;

''(bb) English learners;

''(cc) children with disabilities; and

''(dd) Native Americans, including Indians, as the term is defined in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450b) (including Alaska Natives within the meaning of that term), and Native Hawaiians (as defined in section 7207 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7517)).

''(iii) INFORMATION.—The plan shall include the number of hours of training required for eligible providers and caregivers to engage in annually, as determined by the State.

''(iv) CONSTRUCTION.—The Secretary shall not require an individual or entity that provides child care services for which assistance is provided in accordance with this subchapter to acquire a credential to provide such services. Nothing in this section shall be construed to prohibit a State from requiring a credential.

''(H) CHILD-TO-PROVIDER RATIO STANDARDS.—

''(i) STANDARDS.—The plan shall describe child care standards for child care services for which assistance is made available in accordance with this subchapter, appropriate to the type of child care setting involved, to provide for the safety and developmental needs of the children served, that address—

''(I) group size limits for specific age populations, as determined by the State;

''(II) the appropriate ratio between the number of children and the number of providers, in terms of the age of the children in child care, as determined by the State; and

''(III) required qualifications for such providers, as determined by the State.

''(ii) CONSTRUCTION.—The Secretary may offer guidance to States on child-to-provider ratios described in clause (i) according to setting and age group, but shall not require that the State maintain specific group size limits for specific age populations or child-to-provider ratios for providers who receive assistance in accordance with subchapter.

''(I) HEALTH AND SAFETY REQUIREMENTS.—The plan shall include a certification that there are in effect within the State, under State or local law, requirements designed to protect the health and safety of children that are applicable to child care providers that provide services for which assistance is made available in accordance with this subchapter. Such requirements—

''(i) shall relate to matters including health and safety topics consisting of—

''(I) the prevention and control of infectious diseases (including immunization) and the establishment of a grace period that allows homeless children and children in foster care to receive services under this subchapter while their families (including foster families) are taking any necessary action to comply with immunization and other health and safety requirements;

''(II) prevention of sudden infant death syndrome and use of safe sleeping practices;

''(III) the administration of medication, consistent with standards for parental consent;

''(IV) the prevention of and response to emergencies due to food and allergic reactions;

''(V) building and physical premises safety, including identification of and protection from hazards that can cause bodily injury such as electrical hazards, bodies of water, and vehicular traffic;

''(VI) prevention of shaken baby syndrome and abusive head trauma;

''(VII) emergency preparedness and response planning for emergencies resulting from a natural disaster, or a man-caused event (such as violence at a child care facility), within the meaning of those terms under section 602(a)(1) of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5195a(a)(1));

''(VIII) the handling and storage of hazardous materials and the appropriate disposal of biocontaminants;

''(IX) for providers that offer transportation, if applicable, appropriate precautions in transporting children;

''(X) first aid and cardiopulmonary resuscitation; and

''(XI) minimum health and safety training, to be completed pre-service or during an orientation period in addition to ongoing training, appropriate to the provider setting involved that addresses each of the requirements relating to matters described in subclauses (I) through (X); and

''(ii) may include requirements relating to nutrition, access to physical activity, or any other subject area determined by the State to be necessary to promote child development or to protect children's health and safety.

''(J) COMPLIANCE WITH STATE AND LOCAL HEALTH AND SAFETY REQUIREMENTS.—The plan shall include a certification that procedures are in effect to ensure that child care providers within the State, that provide services for which assistance is made available in accordance with this subchapter, comply with all applicable State and local health and safety requirements as described in subparagraph (I).

''(K) ENFORCEMENT OF LICENSING AND OTHER REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS.—

''(i) CERTIFICATION.—The plan shall include a certification that the State, not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 2014, shall have in effect policies and practices, applicable to licensing or regulating child care providers that provide services for which assistance is made available in accordance with this subchapter and the facilities of those providers, that—

''(I) ensure that individuals who are hired as licensing inspectors in the State are qualified to inspect those child care providers and facilities and have received training in related health and safety requirements, and are trained in all aspects of the State's licensure requirements;

''(II) require licensing inspectors (or qualified inspectors designated by the lead agency) of those child care providers and facilities to perform inspections, with—

''(aa) not less than 1 prelicensure inspection, for compliance with health, safety, and fire standards, of each such child care provider and facility in the State; and

''(bb) not less than annually, an inspection (which shall be unannounced) of each such child care provider and facility in the State for compliance with all child care licensing standards, which shall include an inspection for compliance with health, safety, and fire standards (inspectors may inspect for compliance with all 3 standards at the same time);

''(III) require the ratio of licensing inspectors to such child care providers and facilities in the State to be maintained at a level sufficient to enable the State to conduct inspections of such child care providers and facilities on a timely basis in accordance with Federal, State, and local law; and

''(IV) require licensing inspectors (or qualified inspectors designated by the lead agency) of child care providers and facilities to perform an annual inspection of each license-exempt provider in the State receiving funds under this subchapter (unless the provider is an eligible child care provider as described in section 658P(6)(B)) for compliance with health, safety, and fire standards, at a time to be determined by the State.

''(ii) CONSTRUCTION.—The Secretary may offer guidance to a State, if requested by the State, on a research-based minimum standard regarding ratios described in clause (i)(III) and provide technical assistance to the State on meeting the minimum standard within a reasonable time period, but shall not prescribe a particular ratio.

''(L) COMPLIANCE WITH CHILD ABUSE REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—The plan shall include a certification that child care providers within the State will comply with the child abuse reporting requirements of section 106(b)(2)(B)(i) of the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (42 U.S.C. 5106a(b)(2)(B)(i)).

''(M) MEETING THE NEEDS OF CERTAIN POPULATIONS.—The plan shall describe how the State will develop and implement strategies (which may include alternative reimbursement rates to child care providers, the provision of direct contracts or grants to community-based organizations, offering child care certificates to parents, or other means determined by the State) to increase the supply and improve the quality of child care services for—

''(i) children in underserved areas;

''(ii) infants and toddlers;

''(iii) children with disabilities, as defined by the State; and

''(iv) children who receive care during nontraditional hours.

''(N) PROTECTION FOR WORKING PARENTS.—

''(i) MINIMUM PERIOD.—

''(I) 12-MONTH PERIOD.—The plan shall demonstrate that each child who receives assistance under this subchapter in the State will be considered to meet all eligibility requirements for such assistance and will receive such assistance, for not less than 12 months before the State or designated local entity redetermines the eligibility of the child under this subchapter, regardless of a temporary change in the ongoing status of the child's parent as working or attending a job training or educational program or a change in family income for the child's family, if that family income does not exceed 85 percent of the State median income for a family of the same size.

''(II) FLUCTUATIONS IN EARNINGS.—The plan shall demonstrate how the State's or designated local entity's processes for initial determination and redetermination of such eligibility take into account irregular fluctuations in earnings.

''(ii) REDETERMINATION PROCESS.—The plan shall describe the procedures and policies that are in place to ensure that working parents (especially parents in families receiving assistance under the program of block grants to States for temporary assistance for needy families under part A of title IV of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 601 et seq.)) are not required to unduly disrupt their employment in order to comply with the State's or designated local entity's requirements for redetermination of eligibility for assistance provided in accordance with this subchapter.

''(iii) PERIOD BEFORE TERMINATION.—At the option of the State, the plan shall demonstrate that the State will not terminate assistance provided to carry out this subchapter based on a factor consisting of a parent's loss of work or cessation of attendance at a job training or educational program for which the family was receiving the assistance, without continuing the assistance for a reasonable period of time, of not less than 3 months, after such loss or cessation in order for the parent to engage in a job search and resume work, or resume attendance at a job training or educational program, as soon as possible.

''(iv) GRADUATED PHASEOUT OF CARE.—The plan shall describe the policies and procedures that are in place to allow for provision of continued assistance to carry out this subchapter, at the beginning of a new eligibility period under clause (i)(I), for children of parents who are working or attending a job training or educational program and whose family income exceeds the State's income limit to initially qualify for such assistance, if the family income for the family involved does not exceed 85 percent of the State median income for a family of the same size.

''(O) COORDINATION WITH OTHER PROGRAMS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The plan shall describe how the State, in order to expand accessibility and continuity of care, and assist children enrolled in early childhood programs to receive full-day services, will efficiently, and to the extent practicable, coordinate the services supported to carry out this subchapter with programs operating at the Federal, State, and local levels for children in preschool programs, tribal early childhood programs, and other early childhood programs, including those serving infants and toddlers with disabilities, homeless children, and children in foster care.

''(ii) OPTIONAL USE OF COMBINED FUNDS.—If the State elects to combine funding for the services supported to carry out this subchapter with funding for any program described in clause (i), the plan shall describe how the State will combine the multiple sets of funding and use the combined funding.

''(iii) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in clause (i) shall be construed to affect the priority of children described in clause (i) to receive full-day prekindergarten or Head Start program services.

''(P) PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS.—The plan shall demonstrate how the State encourages partnerships among State agencies,

other public agencies, Indian tribes and tribal organizations, and private entities, including faith-based and community-based organizations, to leverage existing service delivery systems (as of the date of the submission of the application containing the plan) for child care and development services and to increase the supply and quality of child care services for children who are less than 13 years of age, such as by implementing voluntary shared services alliance models.

''(Q) PRIORITY FOR LOW-INCOME POPULATIONS.—The plan shall describe the process the State proposes to use, with respect to investments made to increase access to programs providing high-quality child care and development services, to give priority for those investments to children of families in areas that have significant concentrations of poverty and unemployment and that do not have such programs.

''(R) CONSULTATION.—The plan shall include a certification that the State has developed the plan in consultation with the State Advisory Council on Early Childhood Education and Care designated or established pursuant to section 642B(b)(1)(A)(i) of the Head Start Act (42 U.S.C. 9837b(b)(1)(A)(i)).

''(S) PAYMENT PRACTICES.—The plan shall include—

''(i) a certification that the payment practices of child care providers in the State that serve children who receive assistance under this subchapter reflect generally accepted payment practices of child care providers in the State that serve children who do not receive assistance under this subchapter, so as to provide stability of funding and encourage more child care providers to serve children who receive assistance under this subchapter; and

''(ii) an assurance that the State will, to the extent practicable, implement enrollment and eligibility policies that support the fixed costs of providing child care services by delinking provider reimbursement rates from an eligible child's occasional absences due to holidays or unforseen circumstances such as illness.

''(T) EARLY LEARNING AND DEVELOPMENTAL GUIDELINES.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The plan shall include an assurance that the State will maintain or implement early learning and developmental guidelines (or develop such guidelines if the State does not have such guidelines as of the date of enactment of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 2014) that are appropriate for children from birth to kindergarten entry, describing what such children should know and be able to do, and covering the essential domains of early childhood development for use statewide by child care providers. Such guidelines shall—

''(I) be research-based, developmentally appropriate, and aligned with entry to kindergarten;

''(II) be implemented in consultation with the state educational agency and the State Advisory Council on Early Childhood Education and Care (designated or established pursuant to section 642B(b)(I)(A)(i) of the Head Start Act (42 U.S.C. 9837b(b)(1)(A)(i)); and

''(III) be updated as determined by the State.

''(ii) PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS.—The plan shall include an assurance that funds received by the State to carry out this subchapter will not be used to develop or implement an assessment for children that—

''(I) will be the sole basis for a child care provider being determined to be ineligible to participate in the program carried out under this subchapter;

''(II) will be used as the primary or sole basis to provide a reward or sanction for an individual provider;

''(III) will be used as the primary or sole method for assessing program effectiveness; or

''(IV) will be used to deny children eligibility to participate in the program carried out under this subchapter.

''(iii) EXCEPTIONS.—Nothing in this subchapter shall preclude the State from using a single assessment as determined by the State for children for—

''(I) supporting learning or improving a classroom environment;

''(II) targeting professional development to a provider;

''(III) determining the need for health, mental health, disability, developmental delay, or family support services;

''(IV) obtaining information for the quality improvement process at the State level; or

''(V) conducting a program evaluation for the purposes of providing program improvement and parent information.

''(iv) NO FEDERAL CONTROL.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to authorize an officer or employee of the Federal Government to—

''(I) mandate, direct, control, or place conditions (outside of what is required by this subchapter) around adopting a State's early learning and developmental guidelines developed in accordance with this section;

''(II) establish any criterion that specifies, defines, prescribes, or places conditions (outside of what is required by this subchapter) on a State adopting standards or measures that a State uses to establish, implement, or improve such guidelines, related accountability systems, or alignment of such guidelines with education standards; or

''(III) require a State to submit such guidelines for review.

''(U) DISASTER PREPAREDNESS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The plan shall demonstrate the manner in which the State will address the needs of children in child care services provided through programs authorized under this subchapter, including the need for safe child care, for the period before, during, and after a state of emergency declared by the Governor or a major disaster or emergency (as such terms are defined in section 102 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5122)).

''(ii) STATEWIDE CHILD CARE DISASTER PLAN.—Such plan shall include a statewide child care disaster plan for coordination of activities and collaboration, in the event of an emergency or disaster described in clause (i), among the State agency with jurisdiction over human services, the agency with jurisdiction over State emergency planning, the State lead agency, the State agency with jurisdiction over licensing of child care providers, the local resource and referral organizations, the State resource and referral system, and the State Advisory Council on Early Childhood Education and Care as provided for under section 642B(b) of the Head Start Act (42 U.S.C. 9837b(b)).

''(iii) DISASTER PLAN COMPONENTS.—The components of the disaster plan, for such an emergency or disaster, shall include—

''(I) evacuation, relocation, shelter-in-place, and lock-down procedures, and procedures for communication and reunification with families, continuity of operations, and accommodation of infants and toddlers, children with disabilities, and children with chronic medical conditions;

''(II) guidelines for the continuation of child care services in the period following the emergency or disaster, which may include the provision of emergency and temporary child care services, and temporary operating standards for child care providers during that period; and

''(III) procedures for staff and volunteer emergency preparedness training and practice drills.

''(V) BUSINESS TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—The plan shall describe how the State will develop and implement strategies to strengthen the business practices of child care providers to expand the supply, and improve the quality of, child care services.'';

(3) in paragraph (3)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''as required under'' and inserting ''in accordance with'';

(B) in subparagraph (B)—

(i) by striking ''The State'' and inserting the following:

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The State'';

(ii) by striking ''and any other activity that the State deems appropriate to realize any of the goals specified in paragraphs (2) through (5) of section 658A(b)'' and inserting ''activities that improve access to child care services, including the use of procedures to permit enrollment (after an initial eligibility determination) of homeless children while required documentation is obtained, training and technical assistance on identifying and serving homeless children and their families, and specific outreach to homeless families, and any other activity that the State determines to be appropriate to meet the purposes of this subchapter (which may include an activity described in clause (ii))''; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

''(ii) REPORT BY THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR CHILDREN AND FAMILIES.—

''(I) IN GENERAL.—Not later than September 30 of the first full fiscal year after the date of enactment of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 2014, and September 30 of each fiscal year thereafter, the Secretary (acting through the Assistant Secretary for Children and Families of the Department of Health and Human Services) shall prepare a report that contains a determination about whether each State uses amounts provided to such State for the fiscal year involved under this subchapter in accordance with the priority for services described in clause (i).

''(II) PENALTY FOR NONCOMPLIANCE.—For any fiscal year that the report of the Secretary described in subclause (I) indicates that a State has failed to give priority for services in accordance with clause (i), the Secretary shall—

''(aa) inform the State that the State has until the date that is 6 months after the Secretary has issued such report to fully comply with clause (i);

''(bb) provide the State an opportunity to modify the State plan of such State, to make the plan consistent with the requirements of clause (i), and resubmit such State plan to the Secretary not later than the date described in item (aa); and

''(cc) if the State does not fully comply with clause (i) and item (bb), by the date described in item (aa), withhold 5 percent of the funds that would otherwise be allocated to that State in accordance with this subchapter for the first full fiscal year after that date.

''(III) WAIVER FOR EXTRAORDINARY CIRCUMSTANCES.—Notwithstanding subclause (II) the Secretary may grant a waiver to a State for one year to the penalty applied in subclause (II) if the Secretary determines there are extraordinary circumstances, such as a natural disaster, that prevent the State from complying with clause (i). If the Secretary does grant a waiver to a State under this section, the Secretary shall, within 30

days of granting such waiver, submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees on the circumstances of the waiver including the stated reason from the State on the need for a waiver, the expected impact of the waiver on children served under this program, and any such other relevant information the Secretary deems necessary.

''(iii) CHILD CARE RESOURCE AND REFERRAL SYSTEM.—

''(I) IN GENERAL.—A State may use amounts described in clause (i) to establish or support a system of local or regional child care resource and referral organizations that is coordinated, to the extent determined appropriate by the State, by a statewide public or private nonprofit, community-based or regionally based, lead child care resource and referral organization.

''(II) LOCAL OR REGIONAL ORGANIZATIONS.—The local or regional child care resource and referral organizations supported as described in subclause (I) shall—

''(aa) provide parents in the State with consumer education information referred to in paragraph (2)(E) (except as otherwise provided in that paragraph), concerning the full range of child care options (including faith-based and community-based child care providers), analyzed by provider, including child care provided during nontraditional hours and through emergency child care centers, in their political subdivisions or regions;

''(bb) to the extent practicable, work directly with families who receive assistance under this subchapter to offer the families support and assistance, using information described in item (aa), to make an informed decision about which child care providers they will use, in an effort to ensure that the families are enrolling their children in the most appropriate child care setting to suit their needs and one that is of high quality (as determined by the State);

''(cc) collect data and provide information on the coordination of services and supports, including services under section 619 and part C of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1431, et seq.), for children with disabilities (as defined in section 602 of such Act (20 U.S.C. 1401));

''(dd) collect data and provide information on the supply of and demand for child care services in political subdivisions or regions within the State and submit such information to the State;

''(ee) work to establish partnerships with public agencies and private entities, including faith-based and community-based child care providers, to increase the supply and quality of child care services in the State; and

''(ff) as appropriate, coordinate their activities with the activities of the State lead agency and local agencies that administer funds made available in accordance with this subchapter.'';

(C) in subparagraph (D)—

(i) by striking ''1997 through 2002)'' and inserting ''2015 through 2020''; and

(ii) by striking ''other than families described in paragraph (2)(H)'' and inserting ''including or in addition to families with children described in clause (i), (ii), (iii), or (iv) of paragraph (2)(M)''; and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

''(E) DIRECT SERVICES.—From amounts provided to a State for a fiscal year to carry out this subchapter, the State shall—

''(i) reserve the minimum amount required to be reserved under section 658G, and the funds for costs described in subparagraph (C); and

''(ii) from the remainder, use not less than 70 percent to fund direct services (provided by the State) in accordance with paragraph (2)(A).'';

(4) by striking paragraph (4) and inserting the following:

''(4) PAYMENT RATES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The State plan shall certify that payment rates for the provision of child care services for which assistance is provided in accordance with this subchapter are sufficient to ensure equal access for eligible children to child care services that are comparable to child care services in the State or substate area involved that are provided to children whose parents are not eligible to receive assistance under this subchapter or to receive child care assistance under any other Federal or State program, and shall provide a summary of the facts relied on by the State to determine that such rates are sufficient to ensure such access.

''(B) SURVEY.—The State plan shall—

''(i) demonstrate that the State has, after consulting with the State Advisory Council on Early Childhood Education and Care designated or established in section 642B(b)(1)(A)(i) of the Head Start Act (42 U.S.C. 9837b(b)(1)(A)(i)), local child care program administrators, local child care resource and referral agencies, and other appropriate entities, developed and conducted (not earlier than 2 years before the date of the submission of the application containing the State plan) a statistically valid and reliable survey of the market rates for child care services in the State (that reflects variations in the cost of child care services by geographic area, type of provider, and age of child) or an alternative methodology, such as a cost estimation model, that has been developed by the State lead agency;

''(ii) demonstrate that the State prepared a detailed report containing the results of the State market rates survey or alternative methodology conducted pursuant to clause (i), and made the results of the survey or alternative methodology widely available (not later than 30 days after the completion of such survey or alternative methodology) through periodic means, including posting the results on the Internet;

''(iii) describe how the State will set payment rates for child care services, for which assistance is provided in accordance with this subchapter—

''(I) in accordance with the results of the market rates survey or alternative methodology conducted pursuant to clause (i);

''(II) taking into consideration the cost of providing higher quality child care services than were provided under this subchapter before the date of enactment of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 2014; and

''(III) without, to the extent practicable, reducing the number of families in the State receiving such assistance to carry out this subchapter, relative to the number of such families on the date of enactment of that Act; and

''(iv) describe how the State will provide for timely payment for child care services provided under this subchapter.

''(C) CONSTRUCTION.—

''(i) NO PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION.—Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to create a private right of action if the State acted in accordance with this paragraph.

''(ii) NO PROHIBITION OF CERTAIN DIFFERENT RATES.—Nothing in this subchapter shall be construed to prevent a State from differentiating the payment rates described in subparagraph (B)(iii) on the basis of such factors as—

''(I) geographic location of child care providers (such as location in an urban or rural area);

''(II) the age or particular needs of children (such as the needs of children with disabilities and children served by child protective services);

''(III) whether the providers provide child care services during weekend and other nontraditional hours; or

''(IV) the State's determination that such differentiated payment rates may enable a parent to choose high-quality child care that best fits the parent's needs.''; and

(5) in paragraph (5), by inserting ''(that is not a barrier to families receiving assistance under this subchapter)'' after ''cost sharing''.

(c) TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.—Section 658F(b)(2) of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 9858d(b)(2)) is amended by striking ''section 658E(c)(2)(F)'' and inserting ''section 658E(c)(2)(I)''.

SEC. 6. ACTIVITIES TO IMPROVE THE QUALITY OF CHILD CARE.

Section 658G of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 9858e) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 658G. ACTIVITIES TO IMPROVE THE QUALITY OF CHILD CARE.

''(a) RESERVATION.—

''(1) RESERVATION FOR ACTIVITIES RELATING TO THE QUALITY OF CHILD CARE SERVICES.—A State that receives funds to carry out this subchapter for a fiscal year referred to in paragraph (2) shall reserve and use a portion of such funds, in accordance with paragraph (2), for activities provided directly, or through grants or contracts with local child care resource and referral organizations or other appropriate entities, that are designed to improve the quality of child care services and increase parental options for, and access to, high-quality child care, and is in alignment with a Statewide assessment of the State's needs to carry out such services and care, provided in accordance with this subchapter.

''(2) AMOUNT OF RESERVATIONS.—Such State shall reserve and use—

''(A) to carry out the activities described in paragraph (1), not less than—

''(i) 7 percent of the funds described in paragraph (1), for the first and second full fiscal years after the date of enactment of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 2014;

''(ii) 8 percent of such funds for the third and fourth full fiscal years after the date of enactment; and

''(iii) 9 percent of such funds for the fifth and each succeeding full fiscal year after the date of enactment; and

''(B) in addition to the funds reserved under subparagraph (A), 3 percent of the funds described in paragraph (1) received not later than the second full fiscal year after the date of enactment and received for each succeeding full fiscal year, to carry out the activities described in paragraph (1) and subsection (b)(4), as such activities relate to the quality of care for infants and toddlers.

''(3) STATE RESERVATION AMOUNT.—Nothing in this subsection shall preclude the State from reserving a larger percentage of funds to carry out the activities described in paragraph (1) and subsection (b).

''(b) ACTIVITIES.—Funds reserved under subsection (a) shall be used to carry out no fewer than one of the following activities that will improve the quality of child care services provided in the State:

''(1) Supporting the training and professional development of the child care workforce through activities such as those included under section 658E(c)(2)(G), in addition to—

''(A) offering training and professional development opportunities for child care providers that relate to the use of scientifically-based, developmentally-appropriate and age-appropriate strategies to promote the social, emotional, physical, and cognitive development of children, including those related to

nutrition and physical activity, and offering specialized training for child care providers caring for those populations prioritized in section 658E(c)(2)(Q), and children with disabilities;

''(B) incorporating the effective use of data to guide program improvement;

''(C) including effective behavior management strategies and training, including positive behavior interventions and support models, that promote positive social and emotional development and reduce challenging behaviors, including reducing expulsions of preschool-aged children for such behaviors;

''(E) providing training and outreach on engaging parents and families in culturally and linguistically appropriate ways to expand their knowledge, skills, and capacity to become meaningful partners in supporting their children's positive development;

''(F) providing training corresponding to the nutritional and physical activity needs of children to promote healthy development;

''(G) providing training or professional development for child care providers regarding the early neurological development of children; and

''(H) connecting child care staff members of child care providers with available Federal and State financial aid, or other resources, that would assist child care staff members in pursuing relevant postsecondary training.

''(2) Improving upon the development or implementation of the early learning and developmental guidelines described in section 658E(c)(2)(T) by providing technical assistance to eligible child care providers that enhances the cognitive, physical, social and emotional development, including early childhood development, of participating preschool and school-aged children and supports their overall well-being.

''(3) Developing, implementing, or enhancing a tiered quality rating system for child care providers and services, which may—

''(A) support and assess the quality of child care providers in the State;

''(B) build on State licensing standards and other State regulatory standards for such providers;

''(C) be designed to improve the quality of different types of child care providers and services;

''(D) describe the safety of child care facilities;

''(E) build the capacity of State early childhood programs and communities to promote parents' and families' understanding of the State's early childhood system and the ratings of the programs in which the child is enrolled;

''(F) provide, to the maximum extent practicable, financial incentives and other supports designed to expand the full diversity of child care options and help child care providers improve the quality of services; and

''(G) accommodate a variety of distinctive approaches to early childhood education and care, including but not limited to, those practiced in faith-based settings, community-based settings, child-centered settings, or similar settings that offer a distinctive approach to early childhood development.

''(4) Improving the supply and quality of child care programs and services for infants and toddlers through activities, which may include—

''(A) establishing or expanding high-quality community or neighborhood-based family and child development centers, which may serve as resources to child care providers in order to improve the quality of early childhood services provided to infants and toddlers from low-income families and to help eligible child care providers improve their capacity to offer high-quality, age-appropriate care to infants and toddlers from low-income families;

''(B) establishing or expanding the operation of community or neighborhood-based family child care networks;

''(C) promoting and expanding child care providers' ability to provide developmentally appropriate services for infants and toddlers through training and professional development; coaching and technical assistance on this age group's unique needs from statewide networks of qualified infant-toddler specialists; and improved coordination with early intervention specialists who provide services for infants and toddlers with disabilities under part C of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1431 et seq.);

''(D) if applicable, developing infant and toddler components within the State's quality rating system described in paragraph (3) for child care providers for infants and toddlers, or the development of infant and toddler components in a State's child care licensing regulations or early learning and development guidelines;

''(E) improving the ability of parents to access transparent and easy to understand consumer information about high-quality infant and toddler care; and

''(F) carrying out other activities determined by the State to improve the quality of infant and toddler care provided in the State, and for which there is evidence that the activities will lead to improved infant and toddler health and safety, infant and toddler cognitive and physical development, or infant and toddler well-being, including providing health and safety training (including training in safe sleep practices, first aid, and cardiopulmonary resuscitation) for providers and caregivers.

''(5) Establishing or expanding a statewide system of child care resource and referral services.

''(6) Facilitating compliance with State requirements for inspection, monitoring, training, and health and safety, and with State licensing standards.

''(7) Evaluating and assessing the quality and effectiveness of child care programs and services offered in the State, including evaluating how such programs positively impact children.

''(8) Supporting child care providers in the voluntary pursuit of accreditation by a national accrediting body with demonstrated, valid, and reliable program standards of high quality.

''(9) Supporting State or local efforts to develop or adopt high-quality program standards relating to health, mental health, nutrition, physical activity, and physical development.

''(10) Carrying out other activities determined by the State to improve the quality of child care services provided in the State, and for which measurement of outcomes relating to improved provider preparedness, child safety, child well-being, or entry to kindergarten is possible.

''(c) CERTIFICATION.—Beginning with fiscal year 2016, at the beginning of each fiscal year, the State shall annually submit to the Secretary a certification containing an assurance that the State was in compliance with subsection (a) during the preceding fiscal year and a description of how the State used funds received under this subchapter to comply with subsection (a) during that preceding fiscal year.

''(d) REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—Each State receiving funds under this subchapter shall prepare and submit an annual report to the Secretary, which shall include information about—

''(1) the amount of funds that are reserved under subsection (a);

''(2) the activities carried out under this section; and

''(3) the measures that the State will use to evaluate the State's progress in improving the quality of child care programs and services in the State.

''(e) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary shall offer technical assistance, in accordance with section 658I(a)(3), which may include technical assistance through the use of grants or cooperative agreements, to States for the activities described in subsection (b) at the request of the State.

''(f) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed as providing the Secretary the authority to regulate, direct, dictate, or place conditions (outside of what is required by this subchapter) on a State adopting specific State child care quality activities or progress in implementing those activities.''.

SEC. 7. CRIMINAL BACKGROUND CHECKS.

The Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 9858 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 658G the following:

''SEC. 658H. CRIMINAL BACKGROUND CHECKS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—A State that receives funds to carry out this subchapter shall have in effect—

''(1) requirements, policies, and procedures to require and conduct criminal background checks for child care staff members (including prospective child care staff members) of child care providers described in subsection (c)(1); and

''(2) licensing, regulation, and registration requirements, as applicable, that prohibit the employment of child care staff members as described in subsection (c).

''(b) REQUIREMENTS.—A criminal background check for a child care staff member under subsection (a) shall include—

''(1) a search of the State criminal and sex offender registry or repository in the State where the child care staff member resides, and each State where such staff member resided during the preceding 5 years;

''(2) a search of State-based child abuse and neglect registries and databases in the State where the child care staff member resides, and each State where such staff member resided during the preceding 5 years;

''(3) a search of the National Crime Information Center;

''(4) a Federal Bureau of Investigation fingerprint check using the Integrated Automated Fingerprint Identification System; and

''(5) a search of the National Sex Offender Registry established under the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006 (42 U.S.C. 16901 et seq.).

''(c) PROHIBITIONS.—

''(1) CHILD CARE STAFF MEMBERS.—A child care staff member shall be ineligible for employment by a child care provider that is receiving assistance under this subchapter if such individual—

''(A) refuses to consent to the criminal background check described in subsection (b);

''(B) knowingly makes a materially false statement in connection with such criminal background check;

''(C) is registered, or is required to be registered, on a State sex offender registry or repository or the National Sex Offender Registry established under the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006 (42 U.S.C. 16901 et seq.); or

''(D) has been convicted of a felony consisting of—

''(i) murder, as described in section 1111 of title 18, United States Code;

''(ii) child abuse or neglect;

''(iii) a crime against children, including child pornography;

''(iv) spousal abuse;

''(v) a crime involving rape or sexual assault;

''(vi) kidnapping;

''(vii) arson;

''(viii) physical assault or battery; or

''(ix) subject to subsection (e)(4), a drug-related offense committed during the preceding 5 years; or

''(E) has been convicted of a violent misdemeanor committed as an adult against a child, including the following crimes: child abuse, child endangerment, sexual assault, or of a misdemeanor involving child pornography.

''(2) CHILD CARE PROVIDERS.—A child care provider described in subsection (i)(1) shall be ineligible for assistance provided in accordance with this subchapter if the provider employs a staff member who is ineligible for employment under paragraph (1).

''(d) SUBMISSION OF REQUESTS FOR BACKGROUND CHECKS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—A child care provider covered by subsection (c) shall submit a request, to the appropriate State agency designated by a State, for a criminal background check described in subsection (b), for each child care staff member (including prospective child care staff members) of the provider.

''(2) STAFF MEMBERS.—Subject to paragraph (4), in the case of an individual who became a child care staff member before the date of enactment of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 2014, the provider shall submit such a request—

''(A) prior to the last day described in subsection (j)(1); and

''(B) not less often than once during each 5-year period following the first submission date under this paragraph for that staff member.

''(3) PROSPECTIVE STAFF MEMBERS.—Subject to paragraph (4), in the case of an individual who is a prospective child care staff member on or after that date of enactment, the provider shall submit such a request—

''(A) prior to the date the individual becomes a child care staff member of the provider; and

''(B) not less than once during each 5-year period following the first submission date under this paragraph for that staff member.

''(4) BACKGROUND CHECK FOR ANOTHER CHILD CARE PROVIDER.—A child care provider shall not be required to submit a request under paragraph (2) or (3) for a child care staff member if—

''(A) the staff member received a background check described in subsection (b)—

''(i) within 5 years before the latest date on which such a submission may be made; and

''(ii) while employed by or seeking employment by another child care provider within the State;

''(B) the State provided to the first provider a qualifying background check result, consistent with this subchapter, for the staff member; and

''(C) the staff member is employed by a child care provider within the State, or has been separated from employment from a child care provider within the State for a period of not more than 180 consecutive days.

''(e) BACKGROUND CHECK RESULTS AND APPEALS.—

''(1) BACKGROUND CHECK RESULTS.—The State shall carry out the request of a child care provider for a criminal background check as expeditiously as possible, but not to exceed 45 days after the date on which such request was submitted, and shall provide the results of the criminal background check to such provider and to the current or prospective staff member.

''(2) PRIVACY.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The State shall provide the results of the criminal background check to the provider in a statement that indicates whether a child care staff member (including a prospective child care staff member) is eligible or ineligible for employment described in subsection (c), without revealing any disqualifying crime or other related information regarding the individual.

''(B) INELIGIBLE STAFF MEMBER.—If the child care staff member is ineligible for such employment due to the background check, the State will, when providing the results of the background check, include information related to each disqualifying crime, in a report to the staff member or prospective staff member.

''(C) PUBLIC RELEASE OF RESULTS.—No State shall publicly release or share the results of individual background checks, except States may release aggregated data by crime as listed under subsection (c)(1)(D) from background check results, as long as such data is not personally identifiable information.

''(3) APPEALS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The State shall provide for a process by which a child care staff member (including a prospective child care staff member) may appeal the results of a criminal background check conducted under this section to challenge the accuracy or completeness of the information contained in such member's criminal background report.

''(B) APPEALS PROCESS.—The State shall ensure that—

''(i) each child care staff member shall be given notice of the opportunity to appeal;

''(ii) a child care staff member will receive instructions about how to complete the appeals process if the child care staff member wishes to challenge the accuracy or completeness of the information contained in such member's criminal background report; and

''(iii) the appeals process is completed in a timely manner for each child care staff member.

''(4) REVIEW.—The State may allow for a review process through which the State may determine that a child care staff member (including a prospective child care staff member) disqualified for a crime specified in subsection (c)(1)(D)(ix) is eligible for employment described in subsection (c)(1), notwithstanding subsection (c). The review process shall be consistent with title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e et seq.).

''(5) NO PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to create a private right of action if a provider has acted in accordance with this section.

''(f) FEES FOR BACKGROUND CHECKS.—Fees that a State may charge for the costs of processing applications and administering a criminal background check as required by this section shall not exceed the actual costs to the State for the processing and administration.

''(g) TRANSPARENCY.—The State must ensure that the policies and procedures under section 658H are published on the Web site (or otherwise publicly available venue in the absence of a Web site) of the State and the Web sites of local lead agencies.

''(h) CONSTRUCTION.—

''(1) DISQUALIFICATION FOR OTHER CRIMES.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to prevent a State from disqualifying individuals as child care staff members based on their conviction for crimes not specifically listed in this section that bear upon the fitness of an individual to provide care for and have responsibility for the safety and well-being of children.

''(2) RIGHTS AND REMEDIES.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to alter or otherwise affect the rights and remedies provided for child care staff members residing in a State that disqualifies individuals as child care staff members for crimes not specifically provided for under this section.

''(i) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

''(1) the term 'child care provider' means a center-based child care provider, a family child care provider, or another provider of child care services for compensation and on a regular basis that—

''(A) is not an individual who is related to all children for whom child care services are provided; and

''(B) is licensed, regulated, or registered under State law or receives assistance provided under this subchapter; and

''(2) the term 'child care staff member' means an individual (other than an individual who is related to all children for whom child care services are provided)—

''(A) who is employed by a child care provider for compensation; or

''(B) whose activities involve the care or supervision of children for a child care provider or unsupervised access to children who are cared for or supervised by a child care provider.

''(j) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—A State that receives funds under this subchapter shall meet the requirements of this section for the provision of criminal background checks for child care staff members described in subsection (d)(1) not later than the last day of the second full fiscal year after the date of enactment of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 2014.

''(2) EXTENSION.—The Secretary may grant a State an extension of time, of not more than 1 fiscal year, to meet the requirements of this section if the State demonstrates a good faith effort to comply with the requirements of this section.

''(3) PENALTY FOR NONCOMPLIANCE.—Except as provided in paragraphs (1) and (2), for any fiscal year that a State fails to comply substantially with the requirements of this section, the Secretary shall withhold 5 percent of the funds that would otherwise be allocated to that State in accordance with this subchapter for the following fiscal year.''.

SEC. 8. REPORTS AND INFORMATION.

(a) ADMINISTRATION.—Section 658I(a) of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 9858g(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by inserting a comma after ''publish''; and

(B) by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) by striking paragraph (3) and inserting the following:

''(3) provide technical assistance, such as business technical assistance, as described in section 658E(c)(2)(V), to States (which may include providing assistance on a reimbursable basis) which shall be provided by qualified experts on practices grounded in scientifically valid research, where appropriate, to carry out this subchapter;''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(4) disseminate, for voluntary informational purposes, information on practices that scientifically valid research indicates are most successful in improving the quality of programs that receive assistance with this subchapter; and

''(5) after consultation with the heads of any other Federal agencies involved, issue guidance and disseminate information on best practices regarding the use of funding combined by States as described in section 658E(c)(2)(O)(ii), consistent with laws other than this subchapter.''.

(b) REQUEST FOR RELIEF.—Section 658I of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 9858g), as amended by

subsection (a), is further amended by adding at the end of the following:

''(c) REQUEST FOR RELIEF.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may waive for a period of not more than three years any provision under this subchapter or sanctions imposed upon a State in accordance with subsection (b)(2) upon the State's request for such a waiver if the Secretary finds that—

''(A) the request describes one or more conflicting or duplicative requirements preventing the effective delivery of child care services to justify a waiver, extraordinary circumstances, such as natural disaster or financial crisis, or an extended period of time for a State legislature to enact legislation to implement the provisions of this subchapter;

''(B) such circumstances included in the request prevent the State from complying with any statutory or regulatory requirements of this subchapter;

''(C) the waiver will, by itself, contribute to or enhance the State's ability to carry out the purposes of this subchapter; and,

''(D) the waiver will not contribute to inconsistency with the objectives of this law.

''(2) CONTENTS.—Such request shall be provided to the Secretary in writing and will—

''(A) detail each sanction or provision within this subchapter that the State seeks relief from;

''(B) describe how a waiver from that sanction or provision of this subchapter will, by itself, improve delivery of child care services for children in the State; and

''(C) certify that the health, safety, and well-being of children served through assistance received under this subchapter will not be compromised as a result of the waiver.

''(3) APPROVAL.—Within 90 days after the receipt of a State's request under this subsection, the Secretary shall inform the State of approval or disapproval of the request. If the plan is disapproved, the Secretary shall, at this time, inform the State, the Committee on Education and the Workforce of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate of the reasons for the disapproval and give the State the opportunity to amend the request. In the case of approval, the Secretary shall, within 30 days of granting such waiver, notify and submit a report to the Committee on Education and the Workforce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate on the circumstances of the waiver including each specific sanction or provision waived, the reason as given by the State of the need for a waiver, and the expected impact of the waiver on children served under this program.

''(4) EXTERNAL CONDITIONS.—The Secretary shall not require or impose any new or additional requirements in exchange for receipt of a waiver if such requirements are not specified in this subchapter.

''(5) DURATION.—The Secretary may approve a request under this subsection for a period not to exceed three years, unless a renewal is granted under paragraph (7).

''(6) TERMINATION.—The Secretary shall terminate approval of a request for a waiver authorized under this subsection if the Secretary determines, after notice and opportunity for a hearing, that the performance of a State granted relief under this subsection has been inadequate, or if such relief is no longer necessary to achieve its original purposes.

''(7) RENEWAL.—The Secretary may approve or disapprove a request from a State for renewal of an existing waiver under this subchapter for a period no longer than one year. A State seeking to renew their waiver approval must inform the Secretary of this intent no later than 30 days prior to the expiration date of the waiver. The State shall recertify in its extension request the provisions in paragraph (2) of this subchapter, and shall also explain the need for additional time of relief from such sanction(s) or provisions approved under this law as provided in this subchapter.

''(8) RESTRICTIONS.—Nothing in this subchapter shall be construed as providing the Secretary the authority to permit States to alter the eligibility requirements for eligible children, including work requirements, job training, or educational program participation, that apply to the parents of eligible children under this subchapter. Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to allow the Secretary to waive anything related to his or her authority under this subchapter.''.

(c) REPORTS.—Section 658K(a) of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 9858i(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)(B)—

(A) in clause (ix), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(B) in clause (x), by striking the semicolon at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(xi) whether the children receiving assistance under this subchapter are homeless children;''; and

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking ''December 31, 1997'' and all that follows through ''thereafter'', and inserting ''1 year after the date of the enactment of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 2014, and annually thereafter,'';

(B) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''section 658P(5)'' and inserting ''section 658P(6)'';

(C) in subparagraph (E) by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

''(F) the number of child fatalities occurring among children while in the care and facility of child care providers receiving assistance under this subchapter, listed by type of child care provider and indicating whether the providers (excluding child care providers described in section 658P(6)(B)) are licensed or license-exempt.''.

(d) REPORT BY SECRETARY.—Section 658L of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 9858j) is amended—

(1) by striking the section heading and inserting the following:

''SEC. 658L. REPORTS, HOTLINE, AND WEB SITE.'';

(2) by striking ''Not later'' and inserting the following:

''(a) REPORT BY SECRETARY.—Not later'';

(3) by striking ''1998'' and inserting ''2016'';

(4) by striking ''to the Committee'' and all that follows through ''of the Senate'' and inserting ''to the Committee on Education and the Workforce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate'';

(5) by inserting after ''States.'' the following:

''Such report shall contain a determination around whether each State that uses amounts provided under this subchapter has complied with the priority for services described in sections 658E(c)(2)(Q) and 658E(c)(3)(B).''; and

(6) by adding at the end the following:

''(b) NATIONAL TOLL-FREE HOTLINE AND WEB SITE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall operate, directly or through the use of grants or contracts, a national toll-free hotline and Web site, to—

''(A) develop and disseminate publicly available child care consumer education information for parents and help parents access safe and quality child care services in their community, with a range of price options, that best suits their family's needs; and

''(B) to allow persons to report (anonymously if desired) suspected child abuse or neglect, or violations of health and safety requirements, by an eligible child care provider that receives assistance under this subchapter or a member of the provider's staff.

''(2) REQUIREMENTS.—The Secretary shall ensure that the hotline and Web site meet the following requirements:

''(A) REFERRAL TO LOCAL CHILD CARE PROVIDERS.—The Web site shall be hosted by 'childcare.gov'. The Web site shall enable a child care consumer to enter a zip code and obtain a referral to local child care providers described in subparagraph (B) within a specified search radius.

''(B) INFORMATION.—The Web site shall provide to consumers, directly or through linkages to State databases, at a minimum—

''(i) a localized list of all eligible child care providers, differentiating between licensed and license-exempt providers;

''(ii) any provider-specific information from a Quality Rating and Improvement System or information about other quality indicators, to the extent the information is publicly available and to the extent practicable;

''(iii) any other provider-specific information about compliance with licensing, and health and safety requirements to the extent the information is publicly available and to the extent practicable;

''(iv) referrals to local resource and referral organizations from which consumers can find more information about child care providers; and

''(v) State information about child care subsidy programs and other financial supports available to families.

''(C) NATIONWIDE CAPACITY.—The Web site and hotline shall have the capacity to help families in every State and community in the Nation.

''(D) INFORMATION AT ALL HOURS.—The Web site shall provide, to parents and families, access to information about child care services 24 hours a day.

''(E) SERVICES IN DIFFERENT LANGUAGES.—The Web site and hotline shall ensure the widest possible access to services for families who speak languages other than English.

''(F) HIGH-QUALITY CONSUMER EDUCATION AND REFERRAL.—The Web site and hotline shall ensure that families have access to easy-to-understand child care consumer education and referral services.

''(3) PROHIBITION.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to allow the Secretary to compel States to provide additional data and information that is currently (as of the date of enactment of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 2014) not publicly available, or is not required by this subchapter, unless such additional data are related to the purposes and scope of this subchapter, and are subject to a notice and comment period of no less than 90 days.''.

(e) PROTECTION OF INFORMATION.—Section 658K(a)(1) of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 9858i(a)(1)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(E) PROHIBITION.—Reports submitted to the Secretary under subparagraph (C) shall not contain personally identifiable information.''.

SEC. 9. RESERVATION FOR TOLL-FREE HOTLINE AND WEB SITE; PAYMENTS TO BENEFIT INDIAN CHILDREN; TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND EVALUATION.

Section 658O of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 9858m) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by striking ''The Secretary'' and inserting the following:

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary'';

(ii) by striking ''1 percent, and not more than 2 percent,'' and inserting ''2 percent''; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

''(B) LIMITATIONS.—Notwithstanding subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall only reserve an amount that is greater than 2 percent of the amount appropriated under section 658B, for payments described in subparagraph (A), for a fiscal year (referred to in this subparagraph as the 'reservation year') if —

''(i) the amount appropriated under section 658B for the reservation year is greater than the amount appropriated under section 658B for fiscal year 2014; and

''(ii) the Secretary ensures that the amount allotted to States under subsection (b) for the reservation year is not less than the amount allotted to States under subsection (b) for fiscal year 2014.''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''(3) NATIONAL TOLL-FREE HOTLINE AND WEB SITE.—The Secretary shall reserve up to $1,500,000 of the amount appropriated under this subchapter for each fiscal year for the operation of a national toll-free hotline and Web site, under section 658L(b).

''(4) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary shall reserve up to ½ of 1 percent of the amount appropriated under this subchapter for each fiscal year to support technical assistance and dissemination activities under paragraphs (3) and (4) of section 658I(a).

''(5) RESEARCH, DEMONSTRATION, AND EVALUATION.—The Secretary may reserve ½ of 1 percent of the amount appropriated under this subchapter for each fiscal year to conduct research and demonstration activities, as well as periodic external, independent evaluations of the impact of the program described by this subchapter on increasing access to child care services and improving the safety and quality of child care services, using scientifically valid research methodologies, and to disseminate the key findings of those evaluations widely and on a timely basis.''; and

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (2), by adding at the end the following:

''(D) LICENSING AND STANDARDS.—In lieu of any licensing and regulatory requirements applicable under State or local law, the Secretary, in consultation with Indian tribes and tribal organizations, shall develop minimum child care standards that shall be applicable to Indian tribes and tribal organizations receiving assistance under this subchapter. Such standards shall appropriately reflect Indian tribe and tribal organization needs and available resources, and shall include standards requiring a publicly available application, health and safety standards, and standards requiring a reservation of funds for activities to improve the quality of child care services provided to Indian children.''; and

(B) in paragraph (6), by striking subparagraph (C) and inserting the following:

''(C) LIMITATION.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in clause (ii), the Secretary may not permit an Indian tribe or tribal organization to use amounts provided under this subsection for construction or renovation if the use will result in a decrease in the level of child care services provided by the Indian tribe or tribal organization as compared to the level of child care services provided by the Indian tribe or tribal organization in the fiscal year preceding the year for which the determination under subparagraph (B) is being made.

''(ii) WAIVER.—The Secretary shall waive the limitation described in clause (i) if—

''(I) the Secretary determines that the decrease in the level of child care services provided by the Indian tribe or tribal organization is temporary; and

''(II) the Indian tribe or tribal organization submits to the Secretary a plan that demonstrates that after the date on which the construction or renovation is completed—

''(aa) the level of child care services will increase; or

''(bb) the quality of child care services will improve.''.

SEC. 10. DEFINITIONS.

Section 658P of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 9858n) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (4) and inserting the following:

''(3) CHILD WITH A DISABILITY.—The term 'child with a disability' means—

''(A) a child with a disability, as defined in section 602 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1401);

''(B) a child who is eligible for early intervention services under part C of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1431 et seq.);

''(C) a child who is less than 13 years of age and who is eligible for services under section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 794); and

''(D) a child with a disability, as defined by the State involved.

''(4) ELIGIBLE CHILD.—The term 'eligible child' means an individual—

''(A) who is less than 13 years of age;

''(B) whose family income does not exceed 85 percent of the State median income for a family of the same size, and whose family assets do not exceed $1,000,000 (as certified by a member of such family); and

''(C) who—

''(i) resides with a parent or parents who are working or attending a job training or educational program; or

''(ii) is receiving, or needs to receive, protective services and resides with a parent or parents not described in clause (i).'';

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (5) through (9) as paragraphs (6) through (10), respectively;

(3) by inserting after paragraph (4), the following:

''(5) ENGLISH LEARNER.—The term 'English learner' means an individual who is limited English proficient, as defined in section 9101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801) or section 637 of the Head Start Act (42 U.S.C. 9832).'';

(4) in paragraph (6)(A), as redesignated by paragraph (2)—

(A) in clause (i), by striking ''section 658E(c)(2)(E)'' and inserting ''section 658E(c)(2)(F)''; and

(B) in clause (ii), by striking ''section 658E(c)(2)(F)'' and inserting ''section 658E(c)(2)(I)'';

(5) in paragraph (9), as redesignated by paragraph (2), by striking ''designated'' and all that follows and inserting ''designated or established under section 658D(a).'';

(6) in paragraph (10), as redesignated by paragraph (2), by inserting '', foster parent,'' after ''guardian'';

(7) by redesignating paragraphs (11) through (14) as paragraphs (12) through (15), respectively; and

(8) by inserting after paragraph (10), as redesignated by paragraph (2), the following:

''(11) SCIENTIFICALLY VALID RESEARCH.—The term 'scientifically valid research' includes applied research, basic research, and field-initiated research, for which the rationale, design, and interpretation are soundly developed in accordance with principles of scientific research.''.

SEC. 11. PARENTAL RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES.

Section 658Q of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 9858o) is amended—

(1) by inserting before ''Nothing'' the following:

''(a) IN GENERAL.—''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(b) PARENTAL RIGHTS TO USE CHILD CARE CERTIFICATES.—Nothing in this subchapter shall be construed in a manner—

''(1) to favor or promote the use of grants and contracts for the receipt of child care services under this subchapter over the use of child care certificates; or

''(2) to disfavor or discourage the use of such certificates for the purchase of child care services, including those services provided by private or nonprofit entities, such as faith-based providers.''.

SEC. 12. STUDIES ON WAITING LISTS.

(a) STUDY.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct studies to determine, for each State, the number of families that—

(1) are eligible to receive assistance under the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 9858 et seq.);

(2) have applied for the assistance, identified by the type of assistance requested; and

(3) have been placed on a waiting list for the assistance.

(b) REPORT.—The Comptroller General shall prepare a report containing the results of each study and shall submit the report to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor and Pensions of the Senate, and the Committee on Education and the Workforce of the House of Representatives—

(1) not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act; and

(2) every 2 years thereafter.

(c) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ''State'' has the meaning given the term in section 658P of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 9858n).

SEC. 13. REVIEW OF FEDERAL EARLY LEARNING AND CARE PROGRAMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services, in conjunction with the Secretary of Education, shall conduct an interdepartmental review of all early learning and care programs for children less than 6 years of age in order to—

(1) develop a plan for the elimination of overlapping programs, as identified by the Government Accountability Office's 2012 annual report (GAO–12–342SP); and

(2) make recommendations to Congress for streamlining all such programs.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, in consultation with the Secretary of Education and the heads of all Federal agencies that administer Federal early learning and care programs, shall submit to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate and the Committee on Education and the Workforce of the House of Representatives, a detailed report that outlines the efficiencies that can be achieved by, as well as specific recommendations for, eliminating overlap and fragmentation among all Federal early learning and care programs.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KLINE) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KLINE. 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 material on S. 1086.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of S. 1086, the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 2014.

Mr. Speaker, across the country countless men and women are trying to build a better life for their families. Some are working more for less in order to make ends meet; others are pursuing a degree at a local university or improving their skills at a nearby community college.

Whether going to work or school, most parents face a difficult question: Who will care for my child? Is there a trusted child care provider who will keep my son or daughter safe? And if there is, can I afford it?

For nearly two decades, the Child Care and Development Block Grant program has helped low-income families answer these tough questions. The program funds State efforts to provide vulnerable families access to child care. Parents receive assistance in the form of a voucher or certificate to pay the child care provider of their choice.

Approximately 1.5 million children under the age of 13 are in a child care arrangement funded through the program, including over 25,000 children in my home State of Minnesota. It is a vital safety net for moms and dads trying to lift their families out of poverty.

At a hearing held earlier this year, one witness told the story of a woman named Rita. Speaking of the Child Care and Development Block Grant program, Rita said: ''These Federal investments were quite a serious lifeline for me. I know where I came from, and I do not want to go back.''

Rita's experience is shared by many Americans. Yet despite the importance of the program, it has been almost 20 years since Congress reformed the law. As with any Federal program left on autopilot, problems will emerge, and this program is no different.

Poor coordination across related services and a lack of information make it difficult for parents looking for the best provider to know the full range of options. Perhaps most troubling, a patchwork of State licensing, monitoring, and related safety requirements means some children aren't protected like they should be.

These families deserve better, which is why I am proud to support this important legislation. The bill before us includes a number of commonsense reforms that will strengthen the program and our support of these at-risk families.

For example, the legislation requires all participating child care providers to undergo, at a minimum, an annual inspection to ensure compliance with health, safety, and fire standards. The bill enhances existing training for providers and their workers; so every child is under the care of a well-trained professional.

The legislation also reins in the authority of the Secretary of Health and Human Services to prevent this and future administrations from writing onerous rules that would limit access to this important service.

Mr. Speaker, we have a long way to go before every American enjoys the opportunity and prosperity they and their family deserve. By supporting this bipartisan legislation, we have a chance to help these families succeed and set their children on the path to a bright future.

Before closing, I would like to recognize a number of my colleagues who helped make this legislative achievement possible, including Senators TOM HARKIN and LAMAR ALEXANDER, the chairman and senior Republican on the Senate Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee.

I would also like to thank the senior Democrat on the Education and the Workforce Committee, GEORGE MILLER, and Representatives TODD ROKITA and DAVID LOEBSACK.

Last, but certainly not least, Senators RICHARD BURR and BARBARA MIKULSKI laid the foundation for the bipartisan, bicameral agreement we are discussing today, and we are all grateful for their years of dedication to this really important issue.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, we would not be here today were it not for the hard work and dedication of our staff. I wish time permitted an opportunity to recognize each and every one of them. We are forever grateful for their service.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion to pass S. 1086, as amended. This bill represents a bipartisan, bicameral agreement to reauthorize the Child Care and Development Block Grant, or CCDBG, which is the largest funding source for child care programs. It has been almost 20 years since this CCDBG was reauthorized, and working families and young children should not have to wait any longer.

This block grant provides Federal resources to States to help low-income families pay for child care while a parent works or is in an educational or job training program. This program supports self-sufficiency and promotes workforce stability.

Just as important, this funding offers children vital early learning experiences that set them on a path toward success in school, in the workforce, and the rest of their lives. However, the current law, besides being outdated, has some limitations in ensuring low-income children access to this important program.

For example, the law currently has very few specific requirements on the quality of child care, and States have significant latitude to set quality standards. This results in a great deal of low-quality child care being funded. Recent research has found that about only one-third of child care programs funded by the block grant is actually of good quality.

□ 1645

Access is another concern. Only one in six children eligible for the program is actually enrolled.

This reauthorization seeks to address these problems by improving child care access, making critical new investments, and helping to ensure that children are safe and receive quality care.

For example, this bill increases the number of funds that States must spend on activities to improve the quality of child care, including care for infants and toddlers. It also requires States to conduct a statewide assessment of their needs for quality improvement and to align their quality initiatives with the results of that assessment.

The bill provides States with nearly a dozen proven initiatives that they can deploy to improve quality, ranging from training and professional development to quality rating systems and health and nutrition policies.

The bill also adds State requirements on training and professional development for child care providers, for child-to-staff ratios, annual inspections for providers that receive Federal assistance, coordination with other federally funded early childhood programs, the development and maintenance of early learning and development guidelines, and background checks to keep violent and sexual offenders away from our Nation's children.

This bill expands the requirements for health and safety, and consumer education, including funding for a toll free hotline and a Web site to report suspected child abuse or safety violations.

This legislation also improves access to care by expanding the eligibility of participating families to at least a year, regardless of changes in their income or work schedules or training or educational status. It prioritizes services for families with the lowest incomes. It eases enrollment requirements for homeless children. It helps families connect with quality programs and reduces expulsions from early childhood learning programs by training providers about positive behavior supports and interventions with young children. Finally, it enhances the transparency of the cost of care.

This important legislative update to the CCDBG is long overdue. Improvements made by this legislation are critical for millions of children and their families, and for the future of our Nation.

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

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs.

MCMORRIS RODGERS), the chairwoman of the Republican Conference and a member of our leadership team.

Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, the ranking members, and everyone on both sides for their tremendous work on this important legislation.

Mr. Speaker, right before the August recess the Republican women of the House joined together to highlight a family empowerment package, of which this bill is a critical piece, and I am proud to stand here and say that we are passing another bill in that agenda that empowers women and families.

Women now make up nearly half of our workforce, and in many cases they are the primary breadwinners and the heads of their households. Yet so many of our labor laws and workplace laws were written at a different time—at a time when very few women worked. As moms and dads are seeking their way to get back to where they were after a stagnant economic time, work and job training programs are so important. Moms and dads across the country are still worried about paying their bills, affording the costs needed at home, and securing their kids' futures. They need help, and that is what this bill does.

It empowers and supports families who are seeking better lives for their families. It allows them peace of mind about their children's safety and well-being while they are at work, allowing parents to focus on securing a better future. I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), the ranking member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of Chairman KLINE's amendment in the nature of a substitute to S. 1086.

The Child Care and Development Block Grant, or the CCDBG, is an indispensable resource for millions of children and families nationwide. This enables parents to send their kids to safe, high-quality, and affordable child care so they can work or attend training programs or provide for their families. Meanwhile, the program helps place children in the sorts of environments they need for healthy growth and development.

However, it has been almost 20 years since last we updated this program. In that time, we have learned that we need to do more to ensure that children receive high-quality care in safe settings. That is why this vote is so very important. That is why I am so pleased to have reached bipartisan-bicameral consensus on this legislation.

I would like to thank all of the organizations for their support of this legislation in the process of finalizing this legislation, which has been done over the last several weeks. This bill is not on suspension because it is unimportant; it is on suspension because we recognize the urgency of getting this done this year, and we also recognize a growing national bipartisan consensus about the value of children being placed in high-quality, safe environments during their early learning years.

I would like to include letters from the following organizations: Save the Children; Child Care Aware of America; the National Women's Law Center; the Center For Law and Social Policy; Zero to Three; the Early Care and Education Consortium; the National Association for the Education of Young Children; the Children's Defense Fund; the National Education Association; and the American Federation of Teachers.

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF TEACHERS,
Washington, DC, September 15, 2014.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the more than 1.6 million members of the American Federation of Teachers—including approximately 90,000 early childhood education professionals who work in diverse settings, such as preschool classrooms, family child care, child care centers, Head Start and Early Head Start—I urge you to support, as amended, S. 1086, the bipartisan Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 2014.

The CCDBG helps low-income parents pay for child care so they can work or pursue an education. S. 1086 guarantees a family's child care eligibility for at least 12 months, regardless of any fluctuation in income, job or education. This offers a vital lifeline and a path to the middle class for millions of families across the nation.

It has been nearly 20 years since the CCDBG was last reauthorized. Since that time, early childhood education and child care programs have been transformed by research on child development. This bill reflects the advancement of this knowledge and will truly modernize the program.

S. 1086 brings child care standards into this century by focusing on the health and safety of children, and by giving parents more confidence that their child is being well cared for while they are at work or school. In addition, the bill ensures our youngest and most vulnerable are safe by making inspections annual and requiring that all providers and employees obtain background checks and training before they care for children. S. 1086 also makes all this information more transparent and available to the public, especially to parents and family members.

This bill acknowledges that a component of a high-quality child care program includes having a workforce that is well-prepared and well-trained. This bill requires states to establish a professional development progression and dedicate more funding for training, professional development and advancement of the child care workforce. In particular, the bill, as amended, also addresses the latest data on expulsions from early education programs by requiring that part of the staff training focuses on child behavioral supports. The training and professional development requirements not only will benefit educators and staff working in child care, but also will have lasting, positive effects for the children in their care and those children's families.

However, while this bill is a significant first step toward providing every child in our nation with a high-quality early learning and care program, we know we can't do it right on the cheap. Without the necessary federal resources to implement these important health and safety standards and trainings, states either will be unable to increase the quality of child care and education or will simply have to cut access to high-quality child care to children and families that need it the most. States should not have to choose between quality and access. We look forward to working with Congress to pass this legislation and secure the resources needed for its successful implementation.

Finally, we are equally committed to partnering with Congress to expand high-quality early education for all children from birth to kindergarten.

Thank you for your consideration of our views on this matter. The AFT urges you to vote yes when S. 1086 comes to the House floor.

Sincerely,

RANDI WEINGARTEN,
President.

SAVE THE CHILDREN,
September 14, 2014.

Hon. JOHN KLINE,
Hon. GEORGE MILLER,
House Committee on Education and the Workforce, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN KLINE AND RANKING MEMBER MILLER: On behalf of Save the Children, the leading independent organization dedicated to creating real and lasting change in the lives of children in need in the United States and around the world, we are proud to support your efforts to improve the safety, health and quality of child care through the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 2014. As you well know, Save the Children has dedicated nearly a century of service in America to helping children affected by disasters. And we have valued our tremendous partnership with you to make sure children's safety in emergencies remains a priority—particularly in the child care setting.

We support the proposed CCDBG improvements focused on safety, health and quality improvements. In particular, with 69 million children separated from their parents every work day, we support and commend your inclusion of the disaster preparedness section and disaster plan components §5(u)(iii) which are in line with the recommendations from the National Commission on Children and Disasters which serve as the basis for Save the Children's annual report card on children and disasters, now in its seventh year.

We applaud your leadership on keeping children safe in emergencies and thank you for all you have done and continue to do to create lasting positive change in the lives of children.

Sincerely,

RICHARD BLAND,
National Director, Policy & Advocacy, U.S. Programs, Save the Children.

CHILD CARE AWARE OF AMERICA,
Arlington, VA, September 15, 2014.

Hon. TOM HARKIN,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Health, Education, Labor and Pensions, Washington, DC.
Hon. BARBARA MIKULSKI,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.
Hon. LAMAR ALEXANDER,
Ranking Member, Senate Committee on Health, Education, Labor and Pensions, Washington, DC.
Hon. RICHARD BURR,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.
Hon. JOHN KLINE,
Chairman, House Education and the Workforce Committee, Washington, DC.
Hon. GEORGE MILLER,
Ranking Member, House Education and the Workforce Committee, Washington, DC.
Hon. TODD ROKITA,
U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.
Hon. DAVE LOEBSACK,
U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN HARKIN, RANKING MEMBER ALEXANDER, SENATOR MIKULSKI, AND SENATOR BURR, CHAIRMAN KLINE, RANKING MEMBER MILLER, REPRESENTATIVE ROKITA, AND REPRESENTATIVE LOEBSACK: I am writing on behalf of Child Care Aware® of America (formerly the National Association of Child Care Resource & Referral Agencies, NACCRRA) to express support for your legislation, the Child Care & Development Block Grant Act of 2014, which would reauthorize the Child Care and Development Block Grant and would better protect the health and improve safety of children in child care settings across America.

Families want their children to be safe in child care. They reasonably assume that a child care license means the state has approved some minimum level of protection for children and that the program will promote their healthy development. Our nationwide polling shows that parents also believe there is oversight by the state. However, most state licensing requirements are weak and oversight is weaker.

For over 15 years, reauthorization of the Child Care and Development Block Grant has been Child Care Aware® of America's top legislative priority and we have been working on both the federal and state levels to improve the quality of child care.

Child Care Aware® of America has issued seven licensing studies that show state laws regarding child care settings vary greatly. The most recent report, We Can Do Better: 2013 Update, scored and ranked the states on their child care center program requirements and oversight policies. The average score was 92 out of a total possible score of 150—for a grade of 61 percent.

Children's early years are proven to be the most impactful time to create strong learners. This reauthorization bill is a huge step to move the nation forward ensuring children are safe and receiving the best early learning experiences while in child care. This bill sets the standard all families expect for their children by requiring providers to undergo comprehensive background checks, annual and pre-licensure inspections, and training.

This bill includes significant measures to improve the quality of child care and ensure that all children in child care settings are safe.

Child Care Aware® of America looks forward to working with you to pass this legislation into law. Thank you for your continued leadership in support of our nation's children.

Sincerely,

LYNETTE M. FRAGA, PH.D.,
Executive Director.

L. CAROL SCOTT, PH.D.,
President, Board of Directors.
MICHELLE NOTH MCCREADY,
Director of Policy.
NICHOLAS P. VUCIC,
Senior Government Affairs Associate.

CHILDCARE AWARE OF VIRGINIA,
Richmond, VA, September 15, 2014.

Hon. GEORGE MILLER,
Ranking Member, U.S. House Education and the Workforce Committee, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE MILLER: As Executive Director of Child Care Aware of Virginia, a nonprofit statewide child care resource and referral network, I am writing to thank you and to express full support for the bipartisan, bicameral legislation to reauthorize the Child Care and Development Block Grant (CCDBG).

As an organization that works every day to assist parents in finding child care and to assist child care providers in offering quality child care settings, I see first-hand both the demand for and the need for quality child care. Over Labor Day weekend, the Washington Post ran several stories about the deaths of 60 children in child care in Virginia, 43 in unlicensed care over the past several years. When any child dies it is certainly a tragedy, but it is a double tragedy when you know that the deaths could be prevented by better training for child care providers and more oversight from states.

The bicameral, bipartisan, Child Care and Development Block Grant Reauthorization Act will combine important safety protections for children in child care with more accountability for the expenditure of public dollars.

I commend your leadership and the efforts of Chairman John Kline, Representative Todd Rokita, and Representative David Loebsack as well as the leadership of the Senate Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions (HELP) Committee for setting aside partisan politics and reaching agreement on CCDBG reauthorization to ensure that children are safe in child care. Parents want quality child care. The reauthorization bill is the right policy to both ensure children's safety and strengthen the quality of the workforce.

Choices among quality child care settings is critical for working parents. This legislation is an important milestone in support of working families. Thank you for all that you do in support of working families with children.

Sincerely,

SHARON VEATCH,
Executive Director.

NATIONAL WOMEN'S LAW CENTER,
Washington, DC, September 12, 2014.

Hon. GEORGE MILLER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR RANKING MEMBER MILLER: The National Women's Law Center is pleased that the U.S. House of Representatives is moving forward with the reauthorization of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 2014. Your leadership has resulted in a reauthorization bill that would improve the safety, quality, and accessibility of child care and after-school care for children from birth to age 13. High-quality, well-funded child care helps families work and children learn—both of which are important goals for the nation.

Since the last reauthorization of the Child Care and Development Block Grant in 1996, we have learned much about how to improve the quality of child care and after-school care and how to make child care assistance more accessible to families. Research on the importance of quality has spurred greater efforts to support providers in promoting children's positive development from birth. State initiatives have shown ways to encourage quality improvements through incentives and well-designed reimbursement policies. This bill incorporates these lessons from the research and state innovations in an effort to better protect the health and safety of children in care, improve the quality of care overall and for infants and toddlers in particular, facilitate children and families' sustained access to help in paying for care and more stable child care arrangements, and support providers serving families receiving child care assistance.

We strongly support the goals of this legislation. We will work with you to obtain the funding needed to make these improvements and to allow more children to benefit from these improvements. Between 2006 and 2012, 260,000 fewer eligible children received assistance through the Child Care and Development Block Grant. In addition, most states' payment rates for child care providers are too low to support high-quality care. To reverse the decline in children served and to successfully implement the much-needed improvements included in this legislation, we urge Congress to increase mandatory and discretionary child care funding.

Thank you for all your work on this reauthorization, which is so important for our country's children and families.

Sincerely,

HELEN BLANK,
Director of Child Care and Early Learning.
JOAN ENTMACHER,
Vice President for Family Economic Security.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROKITA), the chairman of the Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education Subcommittee.

Mr. ROKITA. Thank you, Chairman KLINE, for your leadership on this issue.

I also want to thank Ranking Member MILLER, Ranking Member LOEBSACK, our colleagues across the rotunda, and, of course, the staff, who put so much effort into this pro-work, pro-family bill today.

Mr. Speaker, the reauthorization of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Program is an example of what both parties and Houses of Congress can do when we are working together to find commonsense solutions to national issues.

I came to Congress to help all people build better lives for themselves and their families, and now, here with this bill, on this floor today, we get a chance to do that. We work together to protect children's early development and safety, as well as their parents' employment, by preserving State control over a Federal program that serves over a million and a half young Americans. This agreement prevents the administration from imposing early learning guidelines on our States, and it also limits the collection of unnecessary data on our children. At the same time, we have strengthened oversight and accountability at multiple levels of government.

Early childhood care quality will improve because we are enhancing families' access to provider information

while maintaining choice of provider. Families can choose between public and private providers, including religious providers. They can choose larger institutional settings or smaller, or even in-home operations.

As a Member of Congress and as a parent, I know that parents, not the Federal Government, are best positioned to choose child care providers, and this legislation ensures parents will have power over Federal bureaucracies, which are no substitute for a family. We are holding providers to strict safety standards, making sure child care professionals have the most up-to-date training. Parents who must either be working or seeking employment in order to take advantages of this program will have better information to guide their decisions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KLINE. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Speaker, I certainly didn't learn about these improvements before working on the legislation from the ether. The day nursery in Avon, Indiana, was one of my first stops, and we were able to incorporate a lot of what we learned that day and every day after in our work and into this bill.

I thank those whom I met with in the Fourth District of Indiana, where commonsense solutions are part of everyday life, for their help in getting this legislation and the content of it crafted.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education, it is not only my duty to vote for good legislation but for results. Mr. Speaker, I am simply here today to ask my colleagues to vote for this legislation because it will get results. It is one of the things that we can do around here in a bipartisan-bicameral way to show the American people that we are worth our paychecks.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. CLARK).

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, 3 weeks ago I held a policy panel on Women's Economic Equality in my district, and when the audience was asked how many of you have worried about the cost of child care, nearly every hand shot up in the air.

While the skyrocketing cost of quality child care in Massachusetts is among the most expensive in the country, with an average annual cost above $16,000, the problem is not limited to my home State. Across our country, millions of American families report child care as their highest expense—higher than rent or a college education for their children. Without a doubt, the cost of quality child care is now one of the biggest barriers to economic success facing women and families.

Knowing how critical child care is to American families, I am so heartened to see the House take action to reauthorize the Child Care Development Block Grant program, which provides grants to States to offer quality child care that is accessible to low- and moderate-income families. I am grateful that the quality child care provisions of my bill, the Infant and Toddler Care Improvement Act, have been incorporated into this reauthorization.

As a working mom of three, I understand that parents want nothing more than when their children are in child care they are happy, learning, safe, and healthy. Millions of moms and dads across the country, however, are faced with impossible choices because of the lack of access to quality child care. More than 6 million children under the age of 3 are in care of someone other than their parents each week, and 46 percent of the children under 3 live in low-income families.

The Child Care and Development Block Grant and the quality provisions of the Infant and Toddler Care Improvement Act offer a vital lifeline and a path to the middle class for millions of families across the Nation. It is a necessary step towards true economic equality for women, and it gives our kids a great start.

Today's compromised bill is a strong first step, and I look forward to working together to strengthen access to quality child care. This vote is not controversial, nor is it partisan. It is a win for American families. I urge my colleagues to support the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 2014, S. 1086, as amended, and I submit for the RECORD some support letters.

CLASP,
September 12, 2014.

Hon. JOHN KLINE,
Hon. GEORGE MILLER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE KLINE AND REPRESENTATIVE MILLER: The Center for Law and Social Policy (CLASP) is pleased that the House is considering the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 2014. The Center for Law and Social Policy (CLASP) seeks to improve the lives of low-income people by advocating for policies that deliver results that matter.

Child care assistance is an essential work support for low-income parents who struggle to find and keep employment to provide for their families. The Child Care and Development Block Grant (CCDBG) is unique among many federal programs in that its two-generation focus has the ability to support both parents' economic success and children's healthy development.

The CCDBG Act of 2014 is an important step forward for improving the health and safety of child care. It also would make crucial improvements to the program that would allow children to have more sustained access to child care assistance, which helps parents stay in their jobs and move up and supports children's development by providing more continuity in their child care arrangement. The Act seeks to improve the quality of child care overall, with a particular focus on infants and toddlers. Quality infant-toddler child care is rare and particularly out of reach for low-income families. Given the robust body of research on the importance of the earliest years of life for children's growth and success, CLASP supports this effort to improve the quality and availability of infant-toddler care.

While we are pleased to lend our support to this legislation, we note that increasing resources for child care must also be a top Congressional priority. Our most recent analysis shows spending on child care assistance at a 10-year low. Insufficient federal funds have led states to make reductions in their child care programs, with the number of children served falling to a 14-year low. States will need additional resources to meet the goals of the legislation and to ensure that low-income families are able to retain access to this vital program. Expanding economic opportunity for low-income adults today and strengthening the foundation for their children's success in school and in life are worthy investments.

Thank you for your efforts in moving forward this important, bipartisan legislation.

Sincerely,

OLIVIA GOLDEN,
Executive Director.

ZERO TO THREE, NATIONAL CENTER FOR INFANTS, TODDLERS, AND FAMILIES,
September 15, 2014.

Hon. JOHN KLINE,
Chairman, Committee on Education and the Workforce, Washington, DC.
Hon. TODD ROKITA,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education, Committee on Education and the Workforce, Washington, DC.
Hon. GEORGE MILLER,
Ranking Member, Committee on Education and the Workforce, Washington, DC.
Hon. DAVID LOEBSACK,
Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education, Committee on Education and the Workforce, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN KLINE, RANKING MEMBER MILLER, CHAIRMAN ROKITA, AND RANKING MEMBER LOEBSACK: ZERO TO THREE appreciates your leadership in forging a bipartisan agreement that will allow the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 2014 to move forward in the House of Representatives and be enacted before the end of the 113th Congress. Your efforts will have a positive impact on a program critical not only to working parents but to the 6 million infants and toddlers who currently spend some portion of their days in child care.

I commend you for the attention paid to ensuring the health and safety of young children in child care as well as to improving providers' ability to support positive development of the children in their care. We know from research that the quality of child care—whether excellent or poor—is influential in shaping early brain development.

ZERO TO THREE lauds your inclusion of a statutory funding set-aside specifically directed toward improving the quality of care for infants and toddlers. Creating these targeted resources explicitly recognizes what we have long known: the first three years of life are of critical importance to preparing children for success in school and in life. Many of the infants and toddlers in families receiving child care subsidies are the same ones we speak of having a ''word gap'' and development undermined by toxic stress. High-quality care can help them overcome these obstacles. The set-aside will be a clear signal to states that quality services for infants and toddlers are an essential part of the early learning continuum needed to prevent children from falling behind long before they reach prekindergarten age.

ZERO TO THREE strongly supports the goals of this legislation to increase oversight, safety assurances, and quality initiatives for child care programs. To help realize the improvements in this bill, and in order to build the early learning system necessary to put our children on the path to school readiness, starting from birth, a greater infusion of resources is needed. As the real purchasing power of child care funding has eroded over the past few years, many fewer children have been served and provider payments have fallen to such levels that, in most states, high-quality care is largely out of reach of families whose children could most benefit.

We urge you to work with your colleagues in Congress to fulfill the promise of this bipartisan agreement by making additional investments in child care through both the annual appropriations process and through mandatory funding streams in order to provide stability in meeting the needs of the nation's families today and in the years to come.

Sincerely,

MATTHEW MELMED,
Executive Director, ZERO TO THREE.

EARLY CARE AND EDUCATION CONSORTIUM,
Washington, DC, September 15, 2014.

Representative JOHN KLINE,
Washington, DC.
Representative TODD ROKITA,
Washington, DC.
Senator BARBARA MIKULSKI,
Washington, DC.
Senator TOM HARKIN,
Washington, DC.
Representative GEORGE MILLER,
Washington, DC.
Representative DAVID LOEBSACK,
Washington, DC.
Senator RICHARD BURR,
Washington, DC.
Senator LAMAR ALEXANDER,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVES KLINE, MILLER, ROKITA, AND LOEBSACK, AND SENATORS MIKULSKI, BURR, HARKIN AND ALEXANDER, The Early Care and Education Consortium (ECEC) strongly supports the reauthorization of S. 1086, the Child Care & Development Block Grant (CCDBG). We thank you for your leadership in this bipartisan effort to reauthorize the Act. Reauthorizing CCDBG this year will allow states to allocate increased FY2014 funding to improve access to high-quality early care and education programs for low-income children and families.

High-quality care and learning programs provide opportunities for healthy growth and development that produce positive educational achievement and high economic returns on investment through adulthood. Additionally, CCDBG serves as essential support to working families who need to ensure their children are cared for and learning in a safe and high-quality setting during parents' hours of employment, which often exceed the regular school day and extend into the evening.

As the nation's leading trade association of high-quality, non-profit and tax-paying, licensed child care centers, state child care associations, and educational services organizations, ECEC members share a commitment to high quality, meeting the needs of children from infants through school age, and supporting working families in communities across the country. Representing the voice of more than 8,200 centers operating in all 50 states and the District of Columbia, ECEC is also the largest organized alliance of licensed child care centers in the country. A substantial proportion of the children served by ECEC providers are able to access high-quality care because of the support of CCDBG subsidy dollars.

CCDBG has not been reauthorized since 1996. We strongly urge Congressional action to enact important reforms that will directly addresses quality improvement, affordability, continuity of care, and cost stabilization measures that will benefit families and support providers, including:

Stronger health and safety standards for all child care programs that receive federal funding, including required annual inspections of all licensed providers, and annual fire, health and safety inspections of license-exempt, non-family providers.

Technical assistance given to providers on effective business practices;

De-linking provider reimbursement from absence policies that destabilize the cost of care for both families and providers;

Extended subsidy eligibility redetermination periods (12 months);

A new emphasis on technical assistance to providers around effective business practices, and

Increased investment in program quality, with additional activities that include wage incentives, tiered reimbursement, Quality Rating and Improvement Systems, accreditation, and focus on school readiness.

Additionally, this bill will help ensure that low income families can access high quality care by benefiting from a mixed delivery model, and choosing high-quality options within their own community.

We thank you for your leadership in this bipartisan effort to reauthorize the Act, which provides a critical pathway to the middle class for serving as a highly productive workforce of today and the becoming the prepared and productive workforce of tomorrow.

Sincerely,

M.-A. LUCAS,
Executive Director.

EARLY LEARNING POLICY GROUP, LLC,
September 15, 2014.

Hon. GEORGE MILLER,
Ranking Member, U.S. House Education and the Workforce Committee, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE MILLER, As President of the Early Learning Policy Group, I am writing to express my strong support for the bipartisan, bicameral legislation to reauthorize the Child Care and Development Block Grant (CCDBG).

The reality of today's economy is that working parents depend on child care in order to support their families. Nearly 11 million children under age 5 with working mothers spend time every week in some type of child care setting. Families, regardless of income, have trouble finding quality child care.

Child care policies vary greatly by state and until this legislation, there were no minimum health and safety protections for children. The CCDBG Reauthorization Act is truly historic. For the first time, federal policy will support the safety of children in child care by ensuring that licensed providers and those receiving a subsidy to care for low income children will be subject to a comprehensive background check, that programs will be inspected at least once a year, and that parents will have choices among quality settings through a stronger child care workforce and greater focus on activities that improve the quality of child care.

Children should be safe in child care. Parents should feel comfortable that when they choose child care for their children, providers have the training they need to offer settings that will promote the healthy development of children. The federal government should expect accountability from states that set child care policy so that federal money is not used to support unsafe or potentially harmful settings for low income children.

I wholeheartedly commend your efforts and dedication as well as the efforts of Chairman John Kline, Representative Todd Rokita, and Representative David Loebsack along with the efforts of the Senate HELP Committee leadership—Chairman Tom Harkin, Senator Lamar Alexander, Senator Barbara Mikulski, and Senator Richard Burr, for putting aside partisan ideology and politics to agree to common sense public policy improvements to support working families who need child care.

The CCDBG Reauthorization Act is a historic policy marker to enable parents to have quality child care choices in their community. Thank you for supporting working families with children.

Sincerely,

GRACE REEF,
President, Early Learning Policy Group, LLC.

KNOWLEDGE UNIVERSE,
September 15, 2014.

Hon. JOHN KLINE,
Chairman, Committee on Education & the Workforce, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN KLINE: Knowledge Universe enthusiastically offers its support for The Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 2014 (S. 1086). The Child Care and Development Block Grant (CCDBG) plays a critical role in ensuring working parents have access to a quality provider of their choice.

Knowledge Universe is honored to provide high-quality education and care to over 150,000 children across the United States who range in age from six weeks to 12 years of age. We are proud of the diverse group of children whom we serve. Approximately one-third of our children are from low-income working families who receive assistance under CCDBG. The core focus of Knowledge Universe is the quality of each child's educational experience. When parents choose our KinderCare centers, in addition to wanting their child to be safe and well-cared for, they also expect their child to receive the highest-quality educational experience possible.

In the almost two decades since Congress last reauthorized CCDBG, we as a nation have learned much more about the importance of health and safety and quality educational programming, especially for low-income children. The Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 2014 makes important changes to the current CCDBG statute that support quality improvements in the early developmental and educational experiences children will receive through the program.

One of the most important changes The Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 2014 makes to current law relates to continuity of care. For children of low-income working families, the 12-month determination period for eligibility will serve as a critical element for ensuring greater consistency and better kindergarten readiness outcomes. Further, the legislation's health and safety standards requiring all programs, including those that are license-exempt, to undergo annual health, safety, and tire inspections are critical for raising the quality of care provided through CCDBG. Finally, the legislation's focus on the importance of teacher training and professional development to promote children's development and kindergarten readiness, as well as provisions that support Quality Rating and Improvement Systems, national accreditation, and tiered reimbursement are all essential elements for enabling working families to access a high-quality child care provider of their choice.

Knowledge Universe and the families whom we serve thank you for your hard work and dedication to this important CCDBG reauthorization. The quality improvements included in The Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 2014 will work to ensure that more children of low-income working families have access to a high-quality early care and learning experience that best meets their needs.

Sincerely,

CELIA HARTMAN SIMS,
Vice President, Government Relations.

SEPTEMBER 15, 2014.

Hon. GEORGE MILLER,
Ranking Member, U.S. House Education and the Workforce Committee, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE MILLER, As President and Chief Executive Officer of First Children's Finance in Minneapolis, Minnesota, I am writing to express full support for the bipartisan, bicameral legislation to reauthorize the Child Care and Development Block Grant (CCDBG).

Working families with young children depend on child care so that they can obtain and retain a job. At the same time, children need a safe place to be. In too many communities, quality child care is hard to find. The Child Care and Development Block Grant Reauthorization Act will combine important safety protections for children in child care with more accountability for the expenditure of public dollars.

As you know, child care programs are small businesses. From my on the ground experience in working with child care programs, I know that many child care directors have experience in child development but have not had training in best business practices. The inclusion of business technical assistance in the reauthorization bill will lead to more programs operating in an efficient and cost effective manner. No program can offer families a quality setting unless it is fiscally sound.

I commend you as well as Chairman John Kline, Representative Todd Rokita, and Representative David Loebsack for your hard work and dedication on behalf of working families who need child care.

The Child Care and Development Block Grant Reauthorization Act is a giant step toward ensuring that parents have quality choices in their community. Thank you for supporting working families with children.

Sincerely,

GERALD M. CUTTS,
Presidednt and CEO,
First Children's Finance.

CHILDCARE RESOURCES,
September 15, 2014.

Hon. GEORGE MILLER,
Ranking Member, U.S. House Education and the Workforce Committee, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE MILLER, As President of Child Care Resources Inc. (CCRI), a nonprofit child care resource and referral agency in Charlotte, North Carolina, I am writing to express my strong support of the bicameral, bipartisan Child Care and Development Block Grant Reauthorization Act.

On July 26, 2012, I testified before the Senate Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Subcommittee on Children about the need to reauthorize the Child Care and Development Block Grant. My testimony focused on the need to improve children's safety in child care programs (through both requiring fingerprint background checks for child care providers and requiring minimum health and safety protections for children), increasing the quality set-aside, strengthening the child care workforce, conducting at least annual inspections of child care programs, as well as addressing shortcomings of the market rate survey in setting subsidy rates. I am thrilled to see that the child care reauthorization bill addresses each of these areas!

I have been in the child care resource and referral field for 30 years. For more than half of that time, I have been working to reauthorize this measure. Your efforts, along with those of Chairman John Kline, Representative Todd Rokita, and David Loebsack, and your Senate counterparts—Senate HELP Committee Chairman Tom Harkin, Ranking Member Lamar Alexander, Senator Barbara Mikulski, and Senator Richard Burr, to reach a bipartisan agreement on good policy for children in child care are truly to be commended.

Working families with young children need child care, and children need a place to be safe and a setting that promotes their healthy development. Thank you for your continuous efforts over many years on behalf of working families.

Sincerely,

JANET SINGERMAN,
President, Child Care Resources Inc.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

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

Before we close, I want to thank my colleagues in both the House and the Senate for their hard work on this legislation. In the Senate, I am particularly grateful to Chairman HARKIN, Ranking Member ALEXANDER, Senator MIKULSKI, Senator BURR, and their staffs.

I want to thank Ranking Member MILLER and our committee staff members who have helped to steer the passage of this bill, particularly Scott Groginski, Jamie Fasteau, John Hammond, and Brian Levin.

I would like to thank Chairman KLINE and his staff members who worked hard on this bill, including Cristin Kumar, Mandy Shaumburg, and Kathlyn Ehl.

I also want to thank the gentleman from Illinois, Congressman DANNY DAVIS, for his strong efforts to reduce early childhood expulsions, and the many advocates and stakeholders who weighed in on the legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I enter for the RECORD additional letters of support.

RESULTS FOR AMERICA,
September 15, 2014.

RESULTS FOR AMERICA STATEMENT ON CCDBG REAUTHORIZATION

RFA'S MICHELE JOLIN HAILS EFFORT TO SET ASIDE FUNDS FOR RESEARCH AND EVALUATION, BIPARTISAN SUPPORT FOR USING DATA, EVIDENCE AND EVALUATION TO IMPROVE OUTCOMES

WASHINGTON.—Today, following the passage of the Child Care and Development Block Grant (CCDBG) Act in the House of Representatives, Results for America managing partner Michele Jolin issued the following statement. Jolin praised a provision in the legislation that would set aside .5% of funds for evaluating programs to improve the access to, quality, and safety of childcare services, calling it a ''Moneyball'' approach to government that improves outcomes for young people, their families, and communities.

Results for America applauds the passage of the Child Care and Development Block Grant (CCDBG) Act by the House, following the passage of a similar bill in the Senate earlier this year. The inclusion of dedicated funds for research and evaluation will provide vital information for improving the effectiveness of childcare. The strong bipartisan support for this bill shows that lawmakers across the aisle support leveraging less than a penny on the dollar to improve how the rest of the dollar is spent.

''Congress and the Administration are increasingly using data, evidence and evaluation to improve the lives of children, their families and communities, what we call a Moneyball approach to government. Today's reauthorization of CCDB shows that investing in what works is clearly a bipartisan way to address long-term challenges and is another positive step toward improving outcomes,'' said Michele Jolin, Managing Partner, Results for America.

NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION,
Washington, DC, September 15, 2014.

House of Representatives,
Washington, DC 20515.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the three million members of the National Education Association and the students they serve, we urge you to vote YES on the Child Care and Development Block Grant (S. 1086 as amended), which is on the suspension calendar for today. Votes associated with this bill may be included in the NEA Legislative Report Card for the 113th Congress.

The Child Care and Development Block Grant (CCDBG) program helps low-income working families and parents transitioning from welfare to work find safe, supportive, caring environments for their children. It is impossible to have successful early childhood education without good childcare options. Moreover, quality childcare options help ensure that children enter school ready to learn.

S. 1086 incorporates lessons learned from research and the states, improving the likelihood that more children will enter school ready to succeed, by:

Investing in the early childhood workforce. The bill promotes workforce competency, training, and a progression of professional development designed to promote the social, emotional, physical, and cognitive development of children.

Focusing on early learning. States would be required to develop or implement research-based, developmentally appropriate early learning and developmental guidelines for children.

Ensuring the health and safety of children served by the program. The bill strengthens health and safety guidelines for child care providers.

S. 1086 is a good first step towards providing more comprehensive early learning opportunities for low-income children. We urge you to support it.

Sincerely,

MARY KUSLER,
Director, Government Relations.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR THE EDUCATION OF YOUNG CHILDREN,
Washington, DC, September 15, 2014.

Hon. JOHN KLINE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. GEORGE MILLER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN KLINE AND RANKING MEMBER MILLER: On behalf of the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC), the nation's leading early childhood professional association for quality learning from birth through age 8, I want to thank you for the improvements for access and quality in the reauthorization legislation for the Child Care and Development Block Grant.

When families look for child care for their children, they have two questions in mind: What programs offer the high-quality approach best for my child, and what can we afford to pay? Each day, millions of families wonder how they will pay for child care and will their children be safe and learning in the child care that they select. Employers know that child care is important to a stable and productive workforce. Child care providers want training and professional development to serve children well, and a subsidy system that will support the cost of quality and continuity of care.

NAEYC is the nation's largest early childhood program accreditor, setting standards for high-quality programs. Many child care centers and schools seek NAEYC early childhood program accreditation and the U.S. military child care centers also strive to meet our standards. We are pleased to see more attention to the quality of children's experiences and ways to help providers meet and sustain standards for health, safety and children's learning. The promise of early childhood education depends on using the research we know about how children learn and develop and providing access to those early learning experiences for all young children. Your bill makes advances in delivering on that promise, and with the resources to implement these changes and to serve more children, we will come closer to our shared goal of healthy, learning children who are ready for success in school and life.

NAEYC is particularly pleased to see in the bill: Support for quality and compensation improvements for the early childhood workforce; more focus on quality care for infants and toddlers at that crucial period of neurological development; consistency of care and assistance over a 12-month period; the use of child assessments in appropriate ways and explicit prohibition on inappropriate uses; more attention to health and safety in licensed and legally exempt from licensing providers; and an explicit mention of the use of the quality set aside funds for helping programs meet national accreditation standards of quality.

We look forward to working with you for the additional discretionary and mandatory funding that will be needed to make high-quality programs affordable to a larger share of families and to help more early-childhood programs provide superior experiences.

Thank you again for your leadership.

Sincerely,

RHIAN EVANS ALLVIN,
Executive Director.

EASTER SEALS,
Washington, DC, September 15, 2014.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: Easter Seals urges you to support the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act. Easter Seals believes this legislation includes many policies that will go a long way to help families of children with disabilities to contribute to their family's financial well-being by creating more opportunities for young children to access quality child care services.

The bill recognizes the national need to expand training supports to child care providers on how to meet the unique needs of children with disabilities. This training will increase the quality of services available to all children. The National Academy of Sciences, Institute of Medicine, From Neurons to Neighborhoods landmark report validated the overwhelming need in this area:

''Like all families with young children, those whose children have a disability or other special health care need are faced with the challenges of finding good-quality, affordable child care. But the inability or unwillingness of many child-care providers to accept children with disabilities (Berk and Berk, 1982; Chang and Teramoto 1987), transportation and other logistical problems, difficulties with coordinating early intervention and child care services, and the scarcity of appropriately trained caregivers (Kelly and Booth, 1999; Klein and Sheehan, 1987, make the effort to find any child care a tremendous challenge for these families. One multisite student reported that 45 percent of mothers of an infant with a disability reported they were not planning to work because they could not find child care, and 31 percent indicated that they could not find affordable child care (Booth and Kelly 1998, 1999). The severity of the child's disability or illness greatly compounds these problems. (Breslau et al., 1982; Warfield and Hauser-Cram, 1996). Page 324''

Easter Seals affiliates across the country operate nearly 100 full-day, full-year child care programs that meet the needs of children with and without disabilities. These high quality programs are designed to foster the development of all children and support their families. There are simply too few quality choices available to working families. This bill will help increase their options.

Thank you for considering our views.

Sincerely,

KATY BEH NEAS
Senior Vice President, Government Relations.

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF TEACHERS,
Washington, DC, September 15, 2014.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the more than 1.6 million members of the American Federation of Teachers—including approximately 90,000 early childhood education professionals who work in diverse settings, such as preschool classrooms, family child care, child care centers, Head Start and Early Head Start—I urge you to support, as amended, S. 1086, the bipartisan Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 2014.

The CCDBG helps low-income parents pay for child care so they can work or pursue an education. S. 1086 guarantees a family's child care eligibility for at least 12 months, regardless of any fluctuation in income, job or education. This offers a vital lifeline and a path to the middle class for millions of families across the nation.

It has been nearly 20 years since the CCDBG was last reauthorized. Since that time, early childhood education and child care programs have been transformed by research on child development. This bill reflects the advancement of this knowledge and will truly modernize the program.

S. 1086 brings child care standards into this century by focusing on the health and safety of children, and by giving parents more confidence that their child is being well cared for while they are at work or school. In addition, the bill ensures our youngest and most vulnerable are safe by making inspections annual and requiring that all providers and employees obtain background checks and training before they care for children. S. 1086 also makes all this information more transparent and available to the public, especially to parents and family members.

This bill acknowledges that a component of a high-quality child care program includes having a workforce that is well-prepared and well-trained. This bill requires states to establish a professional development progression and dedicate more funding for training, professional development and advancement of the child care workforce. In particular, the bill, as amended, also addresses the latest data on expulsions from early education programs by requiring that part of the staff training focuses on child behavioral supports. The training and professional development requirements not only will benefit educators and staff working in child care, but also will have lasting, positive effects for the children in their care and those children's families.

However, while this bill is a significant first step toward providing every child in our nation with a high-quality early learning and care program, we know we can't do it right on the cheap. Without the necessary federal resources to implement these important health and safety standards and trainings, states either will be unable to increase the quality of child care and education or will simply have to cut access to high-quality child care to children and families that need it the most. States should not have to choose between quality and access. We look forward to working with Congress to pass this legislation and secure the resources needed for its successful implementation.

Finally, we are equally committed to partnering with Congress to expand high-quality early education for all children from birth to kindergarten.

Thank you for your consideration of our views on this matter. The AFT urges you to vote yes when S. 1086 comes to the House floor.

Sincerely,

RANDI WEINGARTEN,
President.

SAVE THE CHILDREN,
September 14, 2014.

Hon. JOHN KLINE,
Hon. GEORGE MILLER,
House Committee on Education and the Workforce, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN KLINE AND RANKING MEMBER MILLER: On behalf of Save the Children, the leading independent organization dedicated to creating real and lasting change in the lives of children in need in the United States and around the world, we are proud to support your efforts to improve the safety, health and quality of child care through the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 2014. As you well know, Save the Children has dedicated nearly a century of service in America to helping children affected by disasters. And we have valued our tremendous partnership with you to make sure children's safety in emergencies remains a priority—particularly in the child care setting.

We support the proposed CCDBG improvements focused on safety, health and quality improvements. In particular, with 69 million children separated from their parents every work day, we support and commend your inclusion of the disaster preparedness section and disaster plan components §5(u)(iii) which are in line with the recommendations from the National Commission on Children and Disasters which serve as the basis for Save the Children's annual report card on children and disasters, now in its seventh year.

We applaud your leadership on keeping children safe in emergencies and thank you for all you have done and continue to do to create lasting positive change in the lives of children.

Sincerely,

RICHARD BLAND,
National Director, Policy & Advocacy, U.S. Programs, Save the Children.

NATIONAL WOMEN'S LAW CENTER
Washington, DC, September 12, 2014.

Hon. GEORGE MILLER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR RANKING MEMBER MILLER: The National Women's Law Center is pleased that the U.S. House of Representatives is moving forward with the reauthorization of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 2014. Your leadership has resulted in a

reauthorization bill that would improve the safety, quality, and accessibility of child care and after-school care for children from birth to age 13. High-quality, well-funded child care helps families work and children learn—both of which are important goals for the nation.

Since the last reauthorization of the Child Care and Development Block Grant in 1996, we have learned much about how to improve the quality of child care and after-school care and how to make child care assistance more accessible to families. Research on the importance of quality has spurred greater efforts to support providers in promoting children's positive development from birth. State initiatives have shown ways to encourage quality improvements through incentives and well-designed reimbursement policies. This bill incorporates these lessons from the research and state innovations in an effort to better protect the health and safety of children in care, improve the quality of care overall and for infants and toddlers in particular, facilitate children and families' sustained access to help in paying for care and more stable child care arrangements, and support providers serving families receiving child care assistance.

We strongly support the goals of this legislation. We will work with you to obtain the funding needed to make these improvements and to allow more children to benefit from these improvements. Between 2006 and 2012, 260,000 fewer eligible children received assistance through the Child Care and Development Block Grant. In addition, most states' payment rates for child care providers are too low to support high-quality care. To reverse the decline in children served and to successfully implement the much-needed improvements included in this legislation, we urge Congress to increase mandatory and discretionary child care funding.

Thank you for all your work on this reauthorization, which is so important for our country's children and families.

Sincerely,

HELEN BLANK,
Director of Child Care and Early Learning.
JOAN ENTMACHER,
Vice President for Family Economic Security.

CHILD CARE AWARE OF AMERICA,
Arlington, VA, September 15, 2014.

Hon. TOM HARKIN,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Health, Education, Labor and Pensions, Washington, DC.
Hon. BARBARA MIKULSKI,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.
Hon. LAMAR ALEXANDER,
Ranking Member, Senate Committee on Health, Education, Labor and Pensions, Washington, DC.
Hon. RICHARD BURR,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.
Hon. JOHN KLINE,
Chairman, House Education and the Workforce Committee, Washington, DC.
Hon. GEORGE MILLER,
Ranking Member, House Education and the Workforce Committee, Washington, DC.
Hon. TODD ROKITA,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.
Hon. DAVE LOEBSACK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN HARKIN, RANKING MEMBER ALEXANDER, SENATOR MIKULSKI, AND SENATOR BURR, CHAIRMAN KLINE, RANKING MEMBER MILLER, REPRESENTATIVE ROKITA, AND REPRESENTATIVE LOEBSACK: I am writing on behalf of Child Care Aware® of America (formerly the National Association of Child Care Resource & Referral Agencies, NACCRRA) to express support for your legislation, the Child Care & Development Block Grant Act of 2014, which would reauthorize the Child Care and Development Block Grant and would better protect the health and improve safety of children in child care settings across America.

Families want their children to be safe in child care. They reasonably assume that a child care license means the state has approved some minimum level of protection for children and that the program will promote their healthy development. Our nationwide polling shows that parents also believe there is oversight by the state. However, most state licensing requirements are weak and oversight is weaker.

For over 15 years, reauthorization of the Child Care and Development Block Grant has been Child Care Aware® of America's top legislative priority and we have been working on both the federal and state levels to improve the quality of child care.

Child Care Aware® of America has issued seven licensing studies that show state laws regarding child care settings vary greatly. The most recent report, We Can Do Better: 2013 Update, scored and ranked the states on their child care center program requirements and oversight policies. The average score was 92 out of a total possible score of 150—for a grade of 61 percent.

Children's early years are proven to be the most impactful time to create strong learners. This reauthorization bill is a huge step to move the nation forward ensuring children are safe and receiving the best early learning experiences while in child care. This bill sets the standard all families expect for their children by requiring providers to undergo comprehensive background checks, annual and pre-licensure inspections, and training.

This bill includes significant measures to improve the quality of child care and ensure that all children in child care settings are safe.

Child Care Aware® of America looks forward to working with you to pass this legislation into law. Thank you for your continued leadership in support of our nation's children.

Sincerely,

LYNETTE M. FRAGA, PH.D.,
Executive Director.
MICHELLE NOTH MCCREADY,
Director of Policy.
L. CAROL SCOTT, PH.D.
President, Board of Directors.
NICHOLAS P. VUCIC,
Senior Government Affairs Associate.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Finally, I would like to thank all of the Members of the House Education and the Workforce Committee and their staffs for their continued commitment to the well-being of American families.

Mr. Speaker, both Chambers and both parties have come together on a bipartisan basis to improve the Child Care and Development Block Grant. This bill is a strong example of what Congress can achieve by working together. The critical updates in the program will give American families the more support that they need and will better prepare our children for the future.

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

Mr. KLINE. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to thank my colleagues here on both sides of the aisle. It is not every day on this floor that we get to do that, but I thank them for their remarks and for the debate today.

I want to reiterate my appreciation for the work done on the other side of the Capitol. Again, it is not something we get to talk about every day, but this is an example of a time when we saw a need. Some could argue that we are a little overdue, since it has been 20 years since this has been reauthorized, but as the ranking member, Mr. MILLER, said, this is on the suspension calendar because we recognize that it needs to be done and because we have come together in a bipartisan-bicameral way to address this need.

So I urge my colleagues to support S. 1086, as amended, the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 2014, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SABLAN. Mr. Speaker, I support S. 1086, reauthorizing the Child Care and Development Block Grant program.

We all talk about jobs bills.

Well, in my district, the Northern Mariana Islands, mothers and fathers in 200 families can go to their jobs every day because their children are being cared for through this program.

That's why it is important to reauthorize Child Care, because it helps people who want to work.

Especially in the Northern Marianas, where we are replacing foreign workers with U.S. workers, we need good child care to make that transition.

And the bill accounts for sudden changes of income, so even when the minimum wage increases in the Marianas this month—as I am glad to say it will—families will keep getting child care—and parents will keep working.

Lastly, S. 1086 improves standards, because all parents want to work without worry, knowing their children are well cared for and safe.

I urge passage of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KLINE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 1086, 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.

□ 1700

LAW SCHOOL CLINIC CERTIFICATION PROGRAM ESTABLISHMENT

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5108) to establish the Law School Clinic Certification Program of the United States Patent and Trademark Office, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5108

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

SECTION 1. USPTO LAW SCHOOL CLINIC CERTIFICATION PROGRAM.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Law School Clinic Certification Program of the United States Patent and Trademark Office, as implemented by the Office, is established as a program entitled the ''Law School Clinic Certification Program''. The Program shall allow students enrolled in a participating law school's clinic to practice patent and trademark law before the Office by drafting, filing, and prosecuting patent or trademark applications, or both, on a pro-bono basis for clients that qualify for assistance from the law school's clinic. The Director shall establish regulations and procedures for application to and participation in the Program. All law schools accredited by the American Bar Association are eligible for participation in the Program, and shall be examined for acceptance using identical criteria established by the Director. The Program shall be in effect for the 10-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) REPORT ON THE PROGRAM.—The Director shall, not later than the last day of the 2-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, submit to the Committees on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and the Senate a report on the Program, describing the number of law schools and law students participating in the Program, the work done through the Program, the benefits of the Program, and any recommendations of the Director for modifications to the Program.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) OFFICE.—The term ''Office'' means the United States Patent and Trademark Office.

(2) PROGRAM.—The term ''Program'' means the Law School Clinic Certification Program established in subsection (a).

(3) DIRECTOR.—The term ''Director'' means the Under Secretary of Commerce for Intellectual Property and Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES) 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 within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 5108, currently 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.

I rise in support of H.R. 5108, a bill to establish the Law School Clinic Certification Program of the United States Patent and Trademark Office.

This bill has bipartisan support. I would like to thank the gentleman from New York, Congressman JEFFRIES, for his leadership on this issue, and I know that he will be speaking here on this matter shortly. It is my pleasure to be the principal Republican cosponsor of the bill which would make this successful pilot program available to law schools all across the country.

This program was first established by the Patent and Trademark Office in 2008 and has allowed law students at 45 participating schools to practice patent or trademark law before the Patent and Trademark Office under the guidance of a supervisor. This practical experience is invaluable and is a worthwhile investment in our Nation's future attorneys.

Expanding this program will also benefit our Nation's small businesses. Through this program inventors and entrepreneurs will gain access to quality legal services and protections that they otherwise often could not afford. Additionally, establishing this program will improve the quality of applications submitted to the Patent and Trademark Office thereby hopefully streamlining the review process.

I am pleased to say that several universities from Ohio, my home State, were already selected to participate in the current pilot program. Those are Case Western Reserve University School of Law in the Cleveland area and the University of Akron School of Law.

The CBO has examined and scored this bill finding that the costs are quite reasonable, about $200,000 a year to operate in all 45 participating schools so we are really getting a bang for our buck with this program.

I look forward to following the successes of this worthwhile program as it unfolds, and I would urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Once again I want to thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES) for his leadership and the fact that this is a bipartisan bill. It is a good thing to see this type of bill move its way through the House.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

H.R. 5108 is legislation designed to enhance the education of law students interested in practicing patent and trademark law while simultaneously helping small businesses, inventors, and entrepreneurs secure patents and trademarks.

I am pleased to partner with my distinguished Judiciary Committee colleague, Representative CHABOT, and am thankful for his support and leadership as well as for the support of Chairman GOODLATTE and Ranking Member CONYERS on this meaningful, bipartisan legislation.

This bill will permanently establish the Law School Clinic Certification Program at the United States Patent and Trademark Office. Currently this program exists only in pilot form; however, it has already helped budding intellectual property law students and attorneys and the innovation sector throughout the country.

The pilot program began in 2008 with only six law schools. Over time it grew to approximately 45 schools. To date more than 1,400 law students have participated in this program.

Since the pilot began, law students under the supervision of a skilled and experienced faculty adviser have submitted 220 patent applications and approximately 650 trademark applications for clients on a pro bono basis. Establishing this program in law will both ensure its continuation and permit law schools throughout the country that meet the PTO's qualifications to participate.

Intellectual property, of course, is a highly technical field. Ordinarily, students do not have the opportunity to submit patent and trademark applications until they become practicing attorneys. This program will provide real-world professional training, and expanding it will enable law students throughout the country to obtain invaluable practical experience that will not only enhance their legal education but will give students who participate in these clinics an opportunity to more meaningfully engage in the job market upon their graduation.

Beyond the advantage to law students, however, this program also provides significant benefits to inventors, entrepreneurs, and small businesses that qualify for pro bono assistance. Some of these inventors or small businesses may not be able to afford patent or trademark attorneys.

In the absence of this program, they may be forced to navigate the complicated legal terrain without technical and professional assistance. The small inventor or start-up company of today may very well become the next major American business of tomorrow in part due to the assistance of the student practitioners and their faculty advisers who participate in the PTO Law School Clinic Certification Program.

This legislation has the support of key stakeholders in the field including the Association of American Universities as well as the International Trademark Association.

In conclusion, let me again thank the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) for his leadership on this bipartisan legislation. H.R. 5108 will help students, small businesses, inventors, startups, law schools, as well as the innovation economy.

I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan, meaningful legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, having no further requests for time, I will yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5108, the ''USPTO Law School Clinic Certification Program Act,'' would make a law school clinic certification pilot program at the USPTO available to all law schools that provide an IP clinic program. I want to thank Rep. JEFFRIES and Rep. CHABOT and all the co-sponsors for putting forth this legislation.

Law school clinic programs provide practical hands on experience to law students, preparing them for the real world, and provide individuals and small business with an avenue for legal representation they may otherwise be unable to afford.

I expect that as the USPTO implements this program that they will continue to maintain rigorous standards, to ensure that these clinic programs meet the highest requirements and that the students participating meet the standard educational and professional criteria for practice before the office.

These IP law clinics are an essential part of law school and they are an important way for schools to help innovators and small businesses and start-ups in their local communities. I think this is a good bill and I support its passage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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. 5108, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. CHABOT. 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 motion will be postponed.

CIBOLA NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE LAND EXCHANGE

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3006) to authorize a land exchange involving the acquisition of private land adjacent to the Cibola National Wildlife Refuge in Arizona for inclusion in the refuge in exchange for certain Bureau of Land Management lands in Riverside County, California, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3006

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

SECTION 1. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act—

(1) MAP 1.—The term ''Map 1'' means the map entitled ''Specified Parcel of Public Land in California'' and dated July 18, 2014.

(2) MAP 2.—The term ''Map 2'' means the map entitled ''River Bottom Farm Lands'' and dated July 18, 2014.

SEC. 2. LAND EXCHANGE, CIBOLA NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE, ARIZONA, AND BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT LAND IN RIVERSIDE COUNTY, CALIFORNIA.

(a) CONVEYANCE OF BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT LAND.—In exchange for the land described in subsection (b), the Secretary of the Interior shall convey to River Bottom Farms of La Paz County, Arizona, all right, title and interest of the United States in and to certain Federal land administered by the Secretary through the Bureau of Land Management consisting of a total of approximately 80 acres in Riverside County, California, identified as ''Parcel A'' on Map 1. The conveyed land shall be subject to valid existing rights, including easements, rights-of-way, utility lines, and any other valid encumbrances on the land as of the date of the conveyance under this section.

(b) CONSIDERATION.—As consideration for the conveyance of the Federal land under subsection (a), River Bottom Farms shall convey to the United States all right, title, and interest of River Bottom Farms in and to two parcels of land contiguous to the Cibola National Wildlife Refuge in La Paz County, Arizona, consisting of a total of approximately 40 acres in La Paz County, Arizona, identified as ''Parcel 301–05–005B–9'' and ''Parcel 301–05–008–0'' on Map 2.

(c) EQUAL VALUE EXCHANGE.—The values of the Federal land and non-Federal land to be exchanged under this section shall be equal or equalized by the payment of cash to the Secretary by River Bottom Farms, if appropriate, pursuant to section 206(b) of the Federal Land Policy Management Act (43 U.S.C. 1716(b)). The value of the land shall be determined by the Secretary through an appraisal performed by a qualified appraiser mutually agreed to by the Secretary and River Bottom Farms and performed in conformance with the Uniform Appraisal Standards for Federal Land Acquisitions (U.S. Department of Justice, December 2000). If the final appraised value of the non-Federal land (''Parcel 301–05–005B–9'' and ''Parcel 301–05–008–0'' on Map 2) exceeds the value of the Federal land (''Parcel A'' on Map 1), the surplus value of the non-Federal land shall be considered to be a donation by River Bottom Farms to the United States.

(d) EXCHANGE TIMETABLE.—The Secretary shall complete the land exchange under this section not later than one year after the date of the expiration of any existing Bureau of Land Management lease agreement or agreements affecting the Federal land (''Parcel A'' on Map 1) to be exchanged under this section, unless the Secretary and River Bottom Farms mutually agree to extend such deadline.

(e) ADMINISTRATION OF ACQUIRED LAND.—The land acquired by the Secretary under subsection (b) shall become part of the Cibola National Wildlife Refuge and be administered in accordance with the laws and regulations generally applicable to the National Wildlife Refuge System.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3006, introduced by our colleague from California (Mr. CALVERT), authorizes an equal value land exchange of private and Federal property. The bill requires the Secretary of the Interior to convey 80 acres of Bureau of Land Management lands in California to River Bottom Farms.

In exchange, River Bottom Farms would be required to donate a 40-acre parcel in Arizona to the Cibola National Wildlife Refuge.

Both land transfers will be subject to valid existing rights, rights-of-way, and other valid encumbrances on the land as of the date of the conveyance. The transaction will be executed as an equal value exchange with values determined by appraisals conducted in accordance with Uniform Appraisal Standards for Federal Land Acquisitions and the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice.

In the event the exchange difference is a detriment to the United States, River Bottom Farms will be required to reimburse the Federal Government to ensure that there is no cost to the American taxpayers.

I urge its adoption, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3006 is commonsense legislation that directs a land exchange between the Federal Government and a private citizen. The land to be conveyed is 80 acres of BLM land in Riverside County, California, that has limited conservation value and is only suitable for farming.

In return, the exchange will add two parcels of land contiguous to the Cibola National Wildlife Refuge that will improve the management efficiency of that refuge.

The refuge lies in the flood plain of the lower Colorado River and is surrounded by desert ridges and washes that serve as the lifeline for thousands of species of animals including the iconic bald eagle that call the refuge its home.

I am pleased to see this bill come to the floor under suspension. This is a bill I have worked on for many years when the refuge was in my district, and I applaud the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT) for taking the lead and seeing it through. Although the refuge is no longer in my district, the area is still important to the people of Arizona and my constituents.

H.R. 3006 is supported by a bipartisan congressional coalition that does not always see eye to eye on many issues, but I am glad to see that we can all agree on this.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT), the author of this legislation.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, the management of our vast amount of Federal lands in our West is a complex challenge that requires the constant attention of our Federal agencies and Congress.

□ 1715

The legislation before the House today, H.R. 3006, would transfer 40 acres of privately-owned land to the Cibola National Wildlife Refuge in Arizona, and in exchange, the Federal Government would transfer 80 acres of isolated Bureau of Land Management land into private ownership. The 80

acres of land being transferred by the BLM was identified for disposal in the 2010 Resource Management Plan by the Yuma Field Office.

Both the Fish and Wildlife Service and the BLM, in addition to the private landowner, support the exchange as proposed by my legislation.

Both land transfers will be subject to valid existing rights, rights-of-way, utility lines, and any valid encumbrances on the land as of the date of the conveyance. As was mentioned, furthermore, the value of the lands to be exchanged will be equalized so the Federal Government will not incur any expenses resulting from this exchange. The legislation represents a net reduction of lands managed by the Federal Government.

The congressional coalition supporting this bill speaks for itself. Its sponsor and three original cosponsors include one Republican and one Democrat from California, as well as one Republican and one Democrat from Arizona.

I am pleased that the House will be taking action on this bill, H.R. 3006, today, and I would encourage all my colleagues to support this commonsense measure.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Natural Resources Committee Chairman DOC HASTINGS and the Subcommittee on Public Lands and Environmental Regulation Chairman ROB BISHOP for their continued leadership on public lands issues that are especially critical to those of us from the West.

I thank my friend from Arizona for leading his side on this bill and look forward to its passage.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and with that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. 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 Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3006, 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.

THE CHESAPEAKE AND OHIO CANAL NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK COMMISSION EXTENSION ACT

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 476) to amend the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal Development Act to extend to the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park Commission.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 476

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

SECTION 1. CHESAPEAKE AND OHIO CANAL NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK COMMISSION.

The Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park Commission (referred to in this Act as the ''Commission'') is authorized in accordance with the provisions of section 6 of the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal Development Act (16 U.S.C. 410y–4), except that the Commission shall terminate 10 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, S. 476 would extend the authorization of the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park Commission for another 10 years. The Commission advises the Secretary of the Interior on matters related to the park which stretches 185 miles through three States and the District of Columbia.

The Commission is intended to provide the diverse governmental jurisdictions a seat at the table on topics involving the canal.

I urge passage, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, S. 476 will amend the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal Development Act to extend the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park Commission.

Extension of the authorization date will allow the continued involvement of the park advisory commission in the decisions that affect this National Historical Park. The advisory commission is now more than 40 years old and serves as an important link between the adjacent communities and the National Park Service.

S. 476 is the companion bill to H.R. 2255 introduced by Representative VAN HOLLEN and is supported by a bipartisan group of Members. Representative VAN HOLLEN is to be commended for his leadership and dedication in seeing this bill through.

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

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. With that, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Maryland, Representative VAN HOLLEN, the sponsor of the legislation,

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, Mr. GRIJALVA, for his assistance on this bill and his leadership on so many other important issues.

Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in rising in strong support of S. 476, a bill to restore the authority of the C&O Canal National Historical Park Commission.

I joined with Congressman FRANK WOLF and Congressman JOHN DELANEY to introduce companion legislation to this bill in the House and appreciate the work of my friend Senator CARDIN in the Senate and Chairman HASTINGS and Ranking Member DEFAZIO of the Natural Resources Committee in bringing this bill to the floor of the House today.

The C&O Canal National Historical Park begins just a few miles from this Capitol and follows the old C&O Canal and towpath for about 185 miles to reach Cumberland, Maryland.

Along the way, as Congressman HASTINGS says, it passes through three States, and it passes through the District of Columbia and many cities and towns in rural areas. It is a treasure of the National Park System, providing a place for visitors to learn about the history of the canal and enjoy the scenic views from the towpath.

The C&O Canal National Historical Park Commission was established along with the park in 1971, an idea of my former boss, Senator Mac Mathias of Maryland, and former Congressman Gilbert Gude of Maryland.

They believed that a park spanning so many diverse communities should have a formal channel through which park management could seek advice and input on park policy from its many neighbors. For years, this model worked well, and then the authority for the Commission expired in 2011.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation before us today would reestablish the Commission, allowing it to resume its critical service. While the Commission would have no authority to make binding park policy, it would serve an important advisory role and strengthen the relationship between the park and its neighbors.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation today and thank the Natural Resources Committee for bringing this to the floor in a bipartisan basis.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers on the legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 476.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. 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 motion will be postponed.

GUN LAKE TRUST LAND REAFFIRMATION ACT

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 1603) to reaffirm that certain land has been taken into trust for the benefit of the Match-E-Be-Nash-She-Wish Band of Pottawatami Indians, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 1603

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 ''Gun Lake Trust Land Reaffirmation Act''.

SEC. 2. REAFFIRMATION OF INDIAN TRUST LAND.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The land taken into trust by the United States for the benefit of the Match-E-Be-Nash-She-Wish Band of Pottawatomi Indians and described in the final Notice of Determination of the Department of the Interior (70 Fed. Reg. 25596 (May 13, 2005)) is reaffirmed as trust land, and the actions of the Secretary of the Interior in taking that land into trust are ratified and confirmed.

(b) NO CLAIMS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, an action (including an action pending in a Federal court as of the date of enactment of this Act) relating to the land described in subsection (a) shall not be filed or maintained in a Federal court and shall be promptly dismissed.

(c) RETENTION OF FUTURE RIGHTS.—Nothing in this Act alters or diminishes the right of the Match-E-Be-Nash-She-Wish Band of Pottawatomi Indians from seeking to have any additional land taken into trust by the United States for the benefit of the Band.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, S. 1603 ratifies a decision of the Secretary of the Interior to acquire land and place it in trust for the Gun Lake Tribe of Michigan.

The 147-acre parcel of land, often called the Bradley Property, is located south of the city of Grand Rapids and within the district of our colleague from Michigan, the chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee, Mr. UPTON, who does support this legislation.

The Bradley Property is the site of a casino operated by the Gun Lake Tribe pursuant to the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act of 1988. The Bradley Property must be held in Federal trust for the tribe to operate its casino.

This bill is necessary to confirm the trust status of the Gun Lake Tribe's land because the United States Supreme Court ruling holding in Carcieri v. Salazar casts doubt on the lawfulness of the Secretary's acquisition of the trust property.

The Gun Lake Tribe was recognized in 1999, but the Secretary acquired land for the tribe pursuant to the Indian Reorganization Act of 1934. This act was intended to benefit tribes recognized and under Federal jurisdiction in 1934.

Mr. Speaker, the bill passed the Senate by unanimous consent, and the Department of the Interior supports the bill. I urge passage of S. 1603, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, since the Supreme Court's decision in 2009, the Carcieri decision, the status of Indian lands across the country have been undermined, and there has been an uptick in frivolous suits against tribal lands. One such lawsuit, the Patchak case, has put a Michigan tribe's trust land, upon which its casino supports approximately 1,000 much-needed jobs was constructed, very much in jeopardy.

S. 1603, the Gun Lake Trust Land Reaffirmation Act, simply affirms that the land taken into trust for the Gun Lake Tribe in Michigan is Indian land and is rightfully held in trust by the United States for the tribe's benefit. The bill passed the Senate by unanimous consent, and it passed House committee markup without event.

Mr. Speaker, I fully support this legislation, as does the tribe, the entire Michigan delegation, and the administration, and I look forward to its passing the House and being signed into law.

I am glad this bill has passed through the legislative process so quickly. That said, I think unless and until we have a Carcieri-fix legislation enacted, these types of piecemeal bills will become routinely needed to protect tribal lands that are rightfully held in trust.

I call upon all of my colleagues in this body and in the Senate to work together to obtain that fix.

With that, Mr. Speaker, we have no further speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Gun Lake Trust Land Reaffirmation Act, a bipartisan bill that will preserve 1,000 jobs in Michigan's 6th district. I would like to thank Chairman DOC HASTINGS for allowing this piece of legislation to move forward through the Natural Resources Committee.

This bill is really quite simple. It merely reaffirms the U.S. Department of Interior's action of taking this land into trust for the Gun Lake Tribe and prevents any future frivolous legal action on this matter.

On these lands, the Tribe opened a gaming and entertainment facility that has created over 1,000 jobs. For a small community, really for any community, 1,000 new jobs is an incredible feat. The local government and schools also benefit from the facility's revenues. This is quite the advantage in a time when municipalities are slashing services due to deficits. Reaffirmation of this land into trust has the utmost support of our local law enforcement, elected officials, and business leaders.

The Gun Lake Trust Land Reaffirmation Act is a good thing for the folks in my district and it is just the right thing to do. I urge you to help pass legislation that will allow jobs to flourish and provide resources for our schools and communities.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 1603.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. 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 motion will be postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 27 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1830

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN) at 6 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

LAW SCHOOL CLINIC CERTIFICATION PROGRAM ESTABLISHMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings

will resume on the motion to suspend the rules previously postponed.

The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5108) to establish the Law School Clinic Certification Program of the United States Patent and Trademark Office, 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. CHABOT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 327, nays 22, not voting 82, as follows:

[Roll No. 497]

YEAS—327

Aderholt	Deutch	Jenkins
Amodei	Diaz-Balart	Johnson (GA)
Barber	Dingell	Johnson (OH)
Barletta	Doggett	Johnson, E. B.
Barr	Doyle	Johnson, Sam
Barrow (GA)	Duckworth	Jolly
Bass	Duffy	Jordan
Beatty	Duncan (TN)	Joyce
Becerra	Edwards	Kaptur
Benishek	Ellison	Keating
Bentivolio	Ellmers	Kelly (IL)
Bera (CA)	Engel	Kelly (PA)
Bilirakis	Enyart	Kennedy
Bishop (GA)	Eshoo	Kildee
Bishop (NY)	Esty	Kilmer
Bishop (UT)	Farenthold	Kind
Black	Farr	King (IA)
Blackburn	Fattah	King (NY)
Blumenauer	Fincher	Kirkpatrick
Bonamici	Fitzpatrick	Kline
Boustany	Fleischmann	Kuster
Brady (PA)	Fleming	Labrador
Braley (IA)	Flores	LaMalfa
Bridenstine	Forbes	Lamborn
Brooks (AL)	Fortenberry	Lance
Brownley (CA)	Foster	Langevin
Bucshon	Foxx	Lankford
Burgess	Frankel (FL)	Larsen (WA)
Byrne	Franks (AZ)	Larson (CT)
Calvert	Frelinghuysen	Latham
Camp	Fudge	Latta
Campbell	Gabbard	Lee (CA)
Capps	Gallego	Levin
Capuano	Garamendi	Lewis
Cárdenas	Garcia	LoBiondo
Carney	Garrett	Loebsack
Carson (IN)	Gibbs	Lofgren
Carter	Gibson	Long
Cartwright	Gohmert	Lowey
Chabot	Goodlatte	Lucas
Chaffetz	Gowdy	Luetkemeyer
Chu	Graves (GA)	Lujan Grisham (NM)
Cicilline	Grayson	
Clark (MA)	Green, Al	Maffei
Clarke (NY)	Green, Gene	Maloney, Carolyn
Clawson (FL)	Griffin (AR)	
Clay	Grijalva	Maloney, Sean
Cleaver	Grimm	Marino
Clyburn	Guthrie	Massie
Coble	Hall	Matsui
Coffman	Hanabusa	McAllister
Cohen	Hanna	McCarthy (CA)
Cole	Harper	McCarthy (NY)
Collins (GA)	Hastings (FL)	McClintock
Collins (NY)	Hastings (WA)	McCollum
Connolly	Heck (NV)	McDermott
Conyers	Heck (WA)	McHenry
Cook	Hensarling	McIntyre
Cooper	Herrera Beutler	McKeon
Costa	Himes	McKinley
Courtney	Hinojosa	McMorris Rodgers
Cramer	Holding	
Crawford	Holt	McNerney
Crenshaw	Honda	Meadows
Cuellar	Horsford	Meehan
Culberson	Hoyer	Meng
Cummings	Hudson	Messer
Daines	Huelskamp	Michaud
Davis (CA)	Huizenga (MI)	Miller (FL)
DeLauro	Hultgren	Miller (MI)
DelBene	Issa	Miller, George
DeSantis	Jeffries	Mullin
Murphy (FL)	Rogers (MI)	Swalwell (CA)
Murphy (PA)	Rokita	Takano
Napolitano	Rooney	Terry
Neal	Ros-Lehtinen	Thompson (CA)
Negrete McLeod	Roskam	Thompson (MS)
Neugebauer	Ross	Thompson (PA)
Noem	Rothfus	Thornberry
Nolan	Roybal-Allard	Tierney
Nugent	Royce	Tipton
Nunes	Ruiz	Titus
O'Rourke	Runyan	Tonko
Olson	Ryan (OH)	Tsongas
Owens	Ryan (WI)	Turner
Pallone	Salmon	Upton
Paulsen	Sarbanes	Valadao
Payne	Scalise	Van Hollen
Perlmutter	Schakowsky	Vela
Perry	Schneider	Velázquez
Peterson	Schock	Visclosky
Petri	Schwartz	Wagner
Pingree (ME)	Schweikert	Walberg
Pittenger	Scott (VA)	Walden
Pitts	Scott, David	Walorski
Poe (TX)	Sensenbrenner	Walz
Pompeo	Serrano	Waters
Price (NC)	Sewell (AL)	Waxman
Quigley	Shea-Porter	Webster (FL)
Rangel	Sherman	Welch
Reed	Shimkus	Wenstrup
Reichert	Shuster	Whitfield
Renacci	Sinema	Williams
Rice (SC)	Sires	Wilson (FL)
Richmond	Slaughter	Wittman
Rigell	Smith (MO)	Womack
Roby	Smith (NE)	Woodall
Roe (TN)	Smith (NJ)	Yoder
Rogers (AL)	Speier	Young (AK)
Rogers (KY)	Stutzman	Young (IN)

NAYS—22

Amash	Kingston	Sessions
Broun (GA)	Lummis	Stockman
Conaway	Mica	Weber (TX)
Duncan (SC)	Mulvaney	Westmoreland
Gosar	Palazzo	Wolf
Griffith (VA)	Posey	Yoho
Hurt	Sanford	
Jones	Scott, Austin	

NOT VOTING—82

Bachmann	Hahn	Peters (MI)
Bachus	Harris	Pocan
Barton	Hartzler	Polis
Brady (TX)	Higgins	Price (GA)
Brooks (IN)	Huffman	Rahall
Brown (FL)	Hunter	Ribble
Buchanan	Israel	Rohrabacher
Bustos	Jackson Lee	Ruppersberger
Butterfield	Kinzinger (IL)	Rush
Capito	Lipinski	Sánchez, Linda T.
Cassidy	Lowenthal	
Castor (FL)	Luján, Ben Ray (NM)	Sanchez, Loretta
Castro (TX)		Schiff
Cotton	Lynch	Schrader
Crowley	Marchant	Simpson
Davis, Danny	Matheson	Smith (TX)
Davis, Rodney	McCaul	Smith (WA)
DeFazio	McGovern	Southerland
DeGette	Meeks	Stewart
Delaney	Miller, Gary	Stivers
Denham	Moore	Tiberi
Dent	Moran	Vargas
DesJarlais	Nadler	Veasey
Gardner	Nunnelee	Wasserman Schultz
Gerlach	Pascrell	
Gingrey (GA)	Pastor (AZ)	Wilson (SC)
Granger	Pearce	Yarmuth
Graves (MO)	Pelosi	
Gutiérrez	Peters (CA)	

□ 1857

Messrs. PALAZZO, HURT, and Mrs. LUMMIS changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

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

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I want to state for the record that today, September 15, 2014, I was unavoidably detained in my district and missed the one rollcall vote of the day. Had I been present I would have voted: ''aye''—Rollcall vote 497—H.R. 5108—To establish the Law School Clinic Certification Program of the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, September 15, 2014.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives that I have been served with a subpoena, issued by the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, for documents in a criminal case.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the precedents and privileges of the House.

Sincerely,

ED CASSIDY,
Chief Administrative Officer.

NORTHERN NEVADA LAND CONSERVATION AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ACT

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5205) to authorize certain land conveyances involving public lands in northern Nevada to promote economic development and conservation, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5205

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 ''Northern Nevada Land Conservation and Economic Development Act''.

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

TITLE I—PINE FOREST RANGE RECREATION ENHANCEMENT ACT

SEC. 101. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Pine Forest Range Recreation Enhancement Act''.

SEC. 102. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) COUNTY.—The term ''County'' means Humboldt County, Nevada.

(2) MAP.—The term ''Map'' means the map entitled ''Proposed Pine Forest Range Wilderness Area'' and dated October 28, 2013.

(3) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Interior.

(4) STATE.—The term ''State'' means the State of Nevada.

(5) WILDERNESS.—The term ''Wilderness'' means the Pine Forest Range Wilderness designated by section 103(a).

SEC. 103. ADDITION TO NATIONAL WILDERNESS PRESERVATION SYSTEM.

(a) DESIGNATION.—In furtherance of the purposes of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.), the approximately 26,000 acres of Federal land managed by the Bureau of Land Management, as generally depicted on the Map, is designated as wilderness and as a component of the National Wilderness Preservation System, to be known as the ''Pine Forest Range Wilderness''.

(b) BOUNDARY.—

(1) ROAD ACCESS.—The boundary of any portion of the Wilderness that is bordered by a road shall be 100 feet from the edge of the road.

(2) ROAD ADJUSTMENTS.—The Secretary shall—

(A) reroute the road running through Long Meadow to the west to remove the road from the riparian area;

(B) reroute the road currently running through Rodeo Flat/Corral Meadow to the east to remove the road from the riparian area;

(C) except for administrative use, close the road along Lower Alder Creek south of Bureau of Land Management road #2083;

(D) manage the access road, through Little Onion Basin, on the east side of the wet meadow to retain travel only on the road existing on the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(E) permanently leave open the Cove Creek road to Little Onion Basin, but close connecting spur roads.

(3) LITTLE ONION BASIN.—Remove Little Onion Basin from the boundaries of the Wilderness and from wilderness designation.

(4) RESERVOIR ACCESS.—The access road to the Little Onion Reservoir dam will remain open and the boundary of the Wilderness shall be 160 feet downstream from the dam at Little Onion Reservoir to allow public access and dam maintenance.

(c) MAP AND LEGAL DESCRIPTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall prepare a map and legal description of the Wilderness.

(2) EFFECT.—The map and legal description prepared under paragraph (1) shall have the same force and effect as if included in this title, except that the Secretary may correct clerical and typographical errors in the map or legal description.

(3) AVAILABILITY.—The map and legal description prepared under paragraph (1) shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the Bureau of Land Management.

(d) WITHDRAWAL.—Subject to valid existing rights, the Wilderness is withdrawn from—

(1) all forms of entry, appropriation, and disposal under the public land laws;

(2) location, entry, and patent under the mining laws; and

(3) disposition under all laws relating to mineral and geothermal leasing or mineral materials.

SEC. 104. ADMINISTRATION.

(a) MANAGEMENT.—Subject to valid existing rights, the Wilderness shall be administered by the Secretary in accordance with the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.), except that—

(1) any reference in the Wilderness Act to the effective date of that Act shall be considered to be a reference to the date of enactment of this Act; and

(2) any reference in the Wilderness Act to the Secretary of Agriculture shall be considered to be a reference to the Secretary.

(b) LIVESTOCK.—The grazing of livestock in the Wilderness, if established before the date of enactment of this Act, is compatible with the Wilderness designation and shall continue, subject to such reasonable regulations, policies, and practices as the Secretary considers to be necessary in accordance with—

(1) section 4(d)(4) of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1133(d)(4)); and

(2) the guidelines set forth in Appendix A of the report of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives accompanying H.R. 2570 of the 101st Congress (House Report 101–405).

(c) ADJACENT MANAGEMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Congress does not intend for the designation of the Wilderness to create a protective perimeter or buffer zone around the Wilderness.

(2) NONWILDERNESS ACTIVITIES.—The fact that nonwilderness activities or uses can be seen, heard, or detected from areas within the Wilderness shall not preclude, limit, control, regulate or determine the conduct or management of the activities or uses outside the boundary of the Wilderness.

(d) MILITARY OVERFLIGHTS.—Nothing in this Act restricts or precludes—

(1) low-level overflights of military aircraft over the Wilderness, including military overflights that can be seen, heard, or detected within the Wilderness;

(2) flight testing and evaluation; or

(3) the designation or creation of new units of special use airspace, or the establishment of military flight training routes, over the Wilderness.

(e) WILDFIRE, INSECT, AND DISEASE MANAGEMENT.—In accordance with section 4(d)(1) of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1133(d)(1)), the Secretary may take such measures in the Wilderness as are necessary for the control of fire, insects, and diseases (including, as the Secretary determines to be appropriate, the coordination of the activities with a State or local agency).

(f) WILDFIRE MANAGEMENT OPERATIONS.—Nothing in this Act shall be construed to preclude a Federal, State, or local agency from conducting wildfire management or prevention operations (including operations using aircraft or mechanized equipment) or to interfere with the authority of the Secretary to authorize mechanical thinning of trees or underbrush to prevent or control the spread of wildfires or the use of mechanized equipment for wildfire pre-suppression and suppression.

(g) WATER RIGHTS.—

(1) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this subsection is to protect the wilderness recreation value of the land designated as wilderness by this title by means other than a federally reserved water right.

(2) STATUTORY CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this title—

(A) constitutes an express or implied reservation by the United States of any water or water rights with respect to the Wilderness;

(B) affects any water rights in the State (including any water rights held by the United States) in existence on the date of enactment of this Act;

(C) establishes a precedent with regard to any future wilderness designations;

(D) affects the interpretation of, or any designation made under, any other Act; or

(E) limits, alters, modifies, or amends any interstate compact or equitable apportionment decree that apportions water among and between the State and other States.

(3) NEVADA WATER LAW.—The Secretary shall follow the procedural and substantive requirements of State law in order to obtain and hold any water rights not in existence on the date of enactment of this Act with respect to the Wilderness.

(4) NEW PROJECTS.—

(A) DEFINITION OF WATER RESOURCE FACILITY.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—In this paragraph, the term ''water resource facility'' means irrigation and pumping facilities, reservoirs, water conservation works, aqueducts, canals, ditches, pipelines, wells, hydropower projects, transmission and other ancillary facilities, and other water diversion, storage, and carriage structures.

(ii) EXCLUSION.—In this paragraph, the term ''water resource facility'' does not include wildlife guzzlers.

(B) RESTRICTION ON NEW WATER RESOURCE FACILITIES.—Except as otherwise provided in this title, on or after the date of enactment of this Act, neither the President nor any other officer, employee, or agent of the United States shall fund, assist, authorize, or issue a license or permit for the development of any new water resource facility within the Wilderness, any portion of which is located in the County.

SEC. 105. RELEASE OF WILDERNESS STUDY AREAS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Blue Lakes and Alder Creek wilderness study areas not designated as wilderness by section 103(a) have been adequately studied for wilderness character and wilderness designation pursuant to section 603 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1782) and are no longer subject to any requirement pertaining to the management of wilderness or wilderness study areas, including the approximately 990 acres in the following locations:

(1) Lower Adler Creek Basin.

(2) Little Onion Basin.

(3) Lands east of Knott Creek reservoir.

(4) Portions of Corral Meadow and the Blue Lakes trailhead.

(b) RELEASE.—Any public land described in subsection (a) that is not designated as wilderness by this Act—

(1) is no longer subject to—

(A) section 603(c) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1782(c)); and

(B) Secretarial Order 3310 issued on December 22, 2010;

(2) shall be managed in accordance with—

(A) land management plans adopted under section 202 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1712); and

(B) cooperative conservation agreements in existence on the date of enactment of this Act; and

(3) shall be subject to the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.).

SEC. 106. WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In accordance with section 4(d)(7) of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1133(d)(7)), nothing in this title affects or diminishes the jurisdiction of the State with respect to fish and wildlife management, including the regulation of hunting, fishing, and trapping, in the Wilderness.

(b) MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES.—In furtherance of the purposes and principles of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.), the Secretary may conduct any management activities in the Wilderness that are necessary to maintain or restore fish and wildlife populations and the habitats to support those populations, if the activities are carried out—

(1) consistent with relevant wilderness management plans; and

(2) in accordance with—

(A) the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.); and

(B) appropriate policies, such as those set forth in Appendix B of the report of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives accompanying H.R. 2570 of the 101st Congress (House Report 101–405), including the occasional and temporary use of motorized vehicles if the use, as determined by the Secretary, would promote healthy, viable, and more naturally distributed wildlife populations that would enhance wilderness recreation with the minimal impact necessary to reasonably accomplish those tasks, including but not limited to, the hunting or culling of wildlife and access for persons with disabilities.

(c) EXISTING ACTIVITIES.—Consistent with section 4(d)(1) of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1133(d)(1)) and in accordance with appropriate policies such as those set forth in Appendix B of the report of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives accompanying H.R. 2570 of the 101st Congress (House Report 101–405), the State may continue to use aircraft, including helicopters, to survey, capture, transplant, monitor, and provide water for wildlife in the Wilderness.

(d) EMERGENCY CLOSURES.—Nothing in this title prohibits a Federal land management agency from establishing or implementing emergency closures or restrictions of the smallest practicable area to provide for public safety, resource conservation, national security, or other purposes as authorized by law. Such an emergency closure shall terminate after a reasonable period of time, but no longer than one year, unless converted to a permanent closure consistent with Federal statute.

(e) MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The State, including a designee of the State, may conduct wildlife management activities in the Wilderness—

(A) in accordance with the terms and conditions specified in the cooperative agreement between the Secretary and the State entitled ''Memorandum of Understanding between the Bureau of Land Management and the Nevada Department of Wildlife Supplement No. 9'' and signed November and December 2003, including any amendments to the cooperative agreement agreed to by the Secretary and the State; and

(B) subject to all applicable laws (including regulations).

(2) REFERENCES; CLARK COUNTY.—For the purposes of this subsection, any reference to Clark County in the cooperative agreement described in paragraph (1)(A) shall be considered to be a reference to the Pine Forest Range Wilderness.

SEC. 107. LAND EXCHANGES.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) FEDERAL LAND.—The term ''Federal land'' means Federal land in the County that is identified for disposal by the Secretary through the Winnemucca Resource Management Plan.

(2) NON-FEDERAL LAND.—The term ''non-Federal land'' means land identified on the Map as ''non-Federal lands for exchange''.

(b) ACQUISITION OF LAND AND INTERESTS IN LAND.—Consistent with applicable law and subject to subsection (c), the Secretary may exchange the Federal land for non-Federal land.

(c) CONDITIONS.—Each land exchange under subsection (a) shall be subject to—

(1) the condition that the owner of the non-Federal land pay not less than 50 percent of all costs relating to the land exchange, including the costs of appraisals, surveys, and any necessary environmental clearances; and

(2) such additional terms and conditions as the Secretary may require.

(d) DEADLINE FOR COMPLETION OF LAND EXCHANGE.—It is the intent of Congress that the land exchanges under this section be completed by not later than 5 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 108. NATIVE AMERICAN CULTURAL AND RELIGIOUS USES.

Nothing in this title alters or diminishes the treaty rights of any Indian tribe (as defined in section 204 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450b)).

TITLE II—LYON COUNTY ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND CONSERVATION ACT

SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

This title may be cited as the ''Lyon County Economic Development and Conservation Act''.

SEC. 202. LAND CONVEYANCE TO YERINGTON, NEVADA.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) CITY.—The term ''City'' means the city of Yerington, Nevada.

(2) FEDERAL LAND.—The term ''Federal land'' means the land located in Lyon County and Mineral County, Nevada, that is identified on the map as ''City of Yerington Sustainable Development Conveyance Lands''.

(3) MAP.—The term ''map'' means the map entitled ''Yerington Land Conveyance'' and dated December 19, 2012.

(4) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Interior.

(b) CONVEYANCES OF LAND TO CITY OF YERINGTON, NEVADA.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, subject to valid existing rights and notwithstanding the land use planning requirements of sections 202 and 203 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1712, 1713), the Secretary shall convey to the City, subject to the agreement of the City, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the Federal land identified on the map.

(2) APPRAISAL TO DETERMINE FAIR MARKET VALUE.—The Secretary shall determine the fair market value of the Federal land to be conveyed—

(A) in accordance with the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.); and

(B) based on an appraisal that is conducted in accordance with—

(i) the Uniform Appraisal Standards for Federal Land Acquisition; and

(ii) the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice.

(3) AVAILABILITY OF MAP.—The map shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the Bureau of Land Management.

(4) APPLICABLE LAW.—Beginning on the date on which the Federal land is conveyed to the City, the development of and conduct of activities on the Federal land shall be subject to all applicable Federal laws (including regulations).

(5) COSTS.—As a condition of the conveyance of the Federal land under paragraph (1), the City shall pay—

(A) an amount equal to the appraised value determined in accordance with paragraph (2); and

(B) all costs related to the conveyance, including all surveys, appraisals, and other administrative costs associated with the conveyance of the Federal land to the City under paragraph (1).

SEC. 203. ADDITION TO NATIONAL WILDERNESS PRESERVATION SYSTEM.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) COUNTY.—The term ''County'' means Lyon County, Nevada.

(2) MAP.—The term ''map'' means the map entitled ''Wovoka Wilderness Area'' and dated December 18, 2012.

(3) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of Agriculture.

(4) STATE.—The term ''State'' means the State of Nevada.

(5) WILDERNESS.—The term ''Wilderness'' means the approximately 47,449 acres to be known as the Wovoka Wilderness designated by subsection (b)(1).

(b) ADDITION TO NATIONAL WILDERNESS PRESERVATION SYSTEM.—

(1) DESIGNATION.—In furtherance of the purposes of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.), the Federal land managed by the Forest Service, as generally depicted on the Map, is designated as wilderness and as a component of the National Wilderness Preservation System, to be known as the ''Wovoka Wilderness''.

(2) BOUNDARY.—The boundary of any portion of the Wilderness that is bordered by a road shall be 150 feet from the centerline of the road.

(3) MAP AND LEGAL DESCRIPTION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall prepare a map and legal description of the Wilderness.

(B) EFFECT.—The map and legal description prepared under subparagraph (A) shall have the same force and effect as if included in this section, except that the Secretary may correct any clerical and typographical errors in the map or legal description.

(C) AVAILABILITY.—Each map and legal description prepared under subparagraph (A) shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the Forest Service.

(4) WITHDRAWAL.—Subject to valid existing rights, the Wilderness is withdrawn from—

(A) all forms of entry, appropriation, or disposal under the public land laws;

(B) location, entry, and patent under the mining laws; and

(C) disposition under all laws relating to mineral and geothermal leasing or mineral materials.

(c) ADMINISTRATION.—

(1) MANAGEMENT.—Subject to valid existing rights, the Wilderness shall be administered by the Secretary in accordance with the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.), except that any reference in that Act to the effective date shall be considered to be a reference to the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) LIVESTOCK.—The grazing of livestock in the Wilderness, if established before the date of enactment of this Act, shall continue, subject to such reasonable regulations, policies, and practices as the Secretary considers to be necessary, in accordance with—

(A) section 4(d)(4) of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1133(d)(4)); and

(B) the guidelines set forth in Appendix A of the report of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives accompanying H.R. 2570 of the 101st Congress (House Report 101–405).

(3) ADJACENT MANAGEMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Congress does not intend for the designation of the Wilderness to create a protective perimeter or buffer zone around the Wilderness.

(B) NONWILDERNESS ACTIVITIES.—The fact that nonwilderness activities or uses can be seen, heard, or detected from areas within the Wilderness shall not preclude, limit, control, regulate, or determine the conduct of the activities or uses outside the boundary of the Wilderness.

(4) OVERFLIGHTS.—Nothing in this section restricts or precludes—

(A) low-level overflights of aircraft over the Wilderness, including military overflights that can be seen, heard, or detected within the Wilderness;

(B) flight testing and evaluation; or

(C) the designation or creation of new units of special use airspace, or the establishment of military flight training routes, over the Wilderness.

(5) WILDFIRE, INSECT, AND DISEASE MANAGEMENT.—In accordance with section 4(d)(1) of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1133(d)(1)), the Secretary may take any measures in the Wilderness that the Secretary determines to be necessary for the control of fire, insects, and diseases, including, as the Secretary determines to be appropriate, the coordination of the activities with a State or local agency.

(6) WATER RIGHTS.—

(A) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this paragraph is to protect the wilderness values of the Wilderness by means other than a federally reserved water right.

(B) STATUTORY CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this paragraph—

(i) constitutes an express or implied reservation by the United States of any water or water rights with respect to the Wilderness;

(ii) affects any water rights in the State (including any water rights held by the United States) in existence on the date of enactment of this Act;

(iii) establishes a precedent with regard to any future wilderness designations;

(iv) affects the interpretation of, or any designation made under, any other Act; or

(v) limits, alters, modifies, or amends any interstate compact or equitable apportionment decree that apportions water among and between the State and other States.

(C) NEVADA WATER LAW.—The Secretary shall follow the procedural and substantive requirements of State law in order to obtain and hold any water rights not in existence on the date of enactment of this Act with respect to the Wilderness.

(D) NEW PROJECTS.—

(i) DEFINITION OF WATER RESOURCE FACILITY.—

(I) IN GENERAL.—In this subparagraph, the term ''water resource facility'' means irrigation and pumping facilities, reservoirs, water conservation works, aqueducts, canals, ditches, pipelines, wells, hydropower projects, transmission and other ancillary facilities, and other water diversion, storage, and carriage structures.

(II) EXCLUSION.—In this subparagraph, the term ''water resource facility'' does not include wildlife guzzlers.

(ii) RESTRICTION ON NEW WATER RESOURCE FACILITIES.—

(I) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this section, on or after the date of enactment of this Act, neither the President nor any officer, employee, or agent of the United States shall fund, assist, authorize, or issue a license or permit for the development of any new water resource facility within the Wilderness, any portion of which is located in the County.

(II) EXCEPTION.—If a permittee within the Bald Mountain grazing allotment submits an application for the development of water resources for the purpose of livestock watering by the date that is 10 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall issue a water development permit within the non-wilderness boundaries of the Bald Mountain grazing allotment for the purposes of carrying out activities under paragraph (2).

(d) WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In accordance with section 4(d)(7) of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1133(d)(7)), nothing in this section affects or diminishes the jurisdiction of the State with respect to fish and wildlife management, including the regulation of hunting, fishing, and trapping, in the Wilderness.

(2) MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES.—In furtherance of the purposes and principles of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.), the Secretary may conduct any management activities in the Wilderness that are necessary to maintain or restore fish and wildlife populations and the habitats to support the populations, if the activities are carried out—

(A) consistent with relevant wilderness management plans; and

(B) in accordance with—

(i) the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.); and

(ii) appropriate policies, such as those set forth in Appendix B of the report of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives accompanying H.R. 2570 of the 101st Congress (House Report 101–405), including the occasional and temporary use of motorized vehicles and aircraft, if the use, as determined by the Secretary, would promote healthy, viable, and more naturally distributed wildlife populations that would enhance wilderness values with the minimal impact necessary to reasonably accomplish those tasks, including but not limited to, the hunting or culling of wildlife and access for persons with disabilities.

(3) EXISTING ACTIVITIES.—Consistent with section 4(d)(1) of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1133(d)(1)) and in accordance with appropriate policies such as those set forth in Appendix B of House Report 101–405, the State may continue to use aircraft, including helicopters, to survey, capture, transplant, monitor, and provide water for wildlife populations in the Wilderness.

(4) EMERGENCY CLOSURES.—Nothing in this title prohibits a Federal land management agency from establishing or implementing emergency closures or restrictions of the smallest practicable area to provide for public safety, resource conservation, national security, or other purposes as authorized by law. Such an emergency closure shall terminate after a reasonable period of time, unless converted to a permanent closure consistent with Federal statute.

(5) MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING.—The State, including a designee of the State, may conduct wildlife management activities in the Wilderness—

(A) in accordance with the terms and conditions specified in the cooperative agreement between the Secretary and the State entitled ''Memorandum of Understanding: Intermountain Region USDA Forest Service and the Nevada Department of Wildlife State of Nevada'' and signed by the designee of the State on February 6, 1984, and by the designee of the Secretary on January 24, 1984, including any amendments, appendices, or additions to the agreement agreed to by the Secretary and the State or a designee; and

(B) subject to all applicable laws (including regulations).

(e) WILDLIFE WATER DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS.—Subject to subsection (c), the Secretary shall authorize structures and facilities, including existing structures and facilities, for wildlife water development projects (including guzzlers) in the Wilderness if—

(1) the structures and facilities will, as determined by the Secretary, enhance wilderness values by promoting healthy, viable, and more naturally distributed wildlife populations; and

(2) the visual impacts of the structures and facilities on the Wilderness can reasonably be minimized.

SEC. 204. WITHDRAWAL.

(a) DEFINITION OF WITHDRAWAL AREA.—In this section, the term ''Withdrawal Area'' means the land administered by the Forest Service and identified as ''Withdrawal Area'' on the map described in section 203(a)(2).

(b) WITHDRAWAL.—Subject to valid existing rights, all Federal land within the Withdrawal Area is withdrawn from all forms of—

(1) entry, appropriation, or disposal under the public land laws;

(2) location, entry, and patent under the mining laws; and

(3) operation of the mineral laws, geothermal leasing laws, and mineral materials laws.

(c) MOTORIZED AND MECHANICAL VEHICLES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), use of motorized and mechanical vehicles in the Withdrawal Area shall be permitted only on roads and trails designated for the use of those vehicles, unless the use of those vehicles is needed—

(A) for administrative purposes; or

(B) to respond to an emergency.

(2) EXCEPTION.—Paragraph (1) does not apply to aircraft (including helicopters).

SEC. 205. NATIVE AMERICAN CULTURAL AND RELIGIOUS USES.

Nothing in this title alters or diminishes the treaty rights of any Indian tribe (as defined in section 204 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450b)).

TITLE III—CARLIN ECONOMIC SELF-DETERMINATION ACT

SEC. 301. CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN FEDERAL LAND TO CITY OF CARLIN, NEVADA.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this title:

(1) CITY.—The term ''City'' means the City of Carlin, Nevada.

(2) FEDERAL LAND.—The term ''Federal land'' means the approximately 1329 acres of land located in the City of Carlin, Nevada, that is identified on the map as ''Carlin Selected Parcels''.

(3) MAP.—The term ''map'' means the map entitled ''Proposed Carlin, Nevada Land Sales'' map dated October 25, 2013.

(b) CONVEYANCE REQUIRED.—Subject to valid existing rights and notwithstanding the land use planning requirements of sections 202 and 203 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1712, 1713), not later than 180 days after the date on which the Secretary of the Interior receives a request from the City for the Federal land, the Secretary shall convey to the City, without consideration, all right, title, and interest of the United States to and in the Federal land.

(c) AVAILABILITY OF MAP.—The map shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the Bureau of Land Management.

(d) COSTS.—At closing for the conveyance authorized under subsection (b) the City shall pay or reimburse the Secretary, as appropriate, for the reasonable transaction and administrative personnel costs associated with the conveyance authorized under such subsection, including the costs of title searches, maps, and boundary and cadastral surveys.

(e) RELEASE OF UNITED STATES.—Upon making the conveyance under subsection (b), notwithstanding any other provision of law, the United States is released from any and all liabilities or claims of any kind or nature arising from the presence, release, or threat of release of any hazardous substance, pollutant, contaminant, petroleum product (or derivative of a petroleum product of any kind), solid waste, mine materials or mining related features (including

tailings, overburden, waste rock, mill remnants, pits, or other hazards resulting from the presence of mining related features) on the Federal land in existence on or before the date of the conveyance.

(f) WITHDRAWAL.—Subject to valid existing rights, the Federal land identified for conveyance shall be withdrawn from all forms of—

(1) entry, appropriation, or disposal under the public land laws;

(2) location, entry, and patent under the mining laws; and

(3) disposition under the mineral leasing, mineral materials and geothermal leasing laws.

TITLE IV—FERNLEY ECONOMIC SELF-DETERMINATION ACT

SEC. 401. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) CITY.—The term ''City'' means the City of Fernley, Nevada.

(2) FEDERAL LAND.—The term ''Federal land'' means the land located in the City of Fernley, Nevada, that is identified as ''Proposed Sale Parcels'' on the map.

(3) MAP.—The term ''map'' means the map entitled ''Proposed Fernley, Nevada, Land Sales'' and dated January 25, 2013.

SEC. 402. CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN FEDERAL LAND TO CITY OF FERNLEY, NEVADA.

(a) CONVEYANCE AUTHORIZED.—Subject to valid existing rights and notwithstanding the land use planning requirements of sections 202 and 203 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1712, 1713), not later than 180 days after the date on which the Secretary of the Interior receives a request from the City for the Federal land, the Secretary shall convey to the City, without consideration, all right, title, and interest of the United States to and in the Federal land.

(b) AVAILABILITY OF MAP.—The map shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the Bureau of Land Management.

(c) RESERVATION OF EASEMENTS AND RIGHTS-OF-WAY.—The City and the Bureau of Reclamation may retain easements or rights-of-way on the Federal land to be conveyed, including easements or rights-of-way that the Bureau of Reclamation determines are necessary to carry out—

(1) the operation and maintenance of the Truckee Canal Irrigation District Canal; or

(2) the Newlands Project.

(d) COSTS.—At closing for the conveyance authorized under subsection (a), the City shall pay or reimburse the Secretary, as appropriate, for the reasonable transaction and administrative personnel costs associated with the conveyance authorized under such subsection, including the costs of title searches, maps, and boundary and cadastral surveys.

SEC. 403. RELEASE OF UNITED STATES.

Upon making the conveyance under section 402, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the United States is released from any and all liabilities or claims of any kind or nature arising from the presence, release, or threat of release of any hazardous substance, pollutant, contaminant, petroleum product (or derivative of a petroleum product of any kind), solid waste, mine materials or mining related features (including tailings, overburden, waste rock, mill remnants, pits, or other hazards resulting from the presence of mining related features) on the Federal land in existence on or before the date of the conveyance.

TITLE V—RESTORING STOREY COUNTY ACT

SEC. 501. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Restoring Storey County Act''.

SEC. 502. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) COUNTY.—The term ''County'' means Storey County, Nevada.

(2) FEDERAL LAND.—The term ''Federal land'' means the approximately 1,745 acres of Federal land identified on the map as ''BLM Owned - County Request Transfer''.

(3) MAP.—The term ''map'' means the map titled ''Restoring Storey County Act'' and dated November 20, 2012.

(4) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Bureau of Land Management.

SEC. 503. CONVEYANCE OF FEDERAL LAND IN STOREY COUNTY, NEVADA.

Subject to valid existing rights and notwithstanding the land use planning requirements of sections 202 and 203 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1712, 1713), not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act and if requested by the County, the Secretary shall convey to the County, by quitclaim deed, all surface rights of the United States in and to the Federal land, including any improvements thereon. All costs associated with the conveyance under this section shall be the responsibility of the Bureau of Land Management.

TITLE VI—ELKO MOTOCROSS AND TRIBAL CONVEYANCE ACT

SEC. 601. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Elko Motocross and Tribal Conveyance Act''.

SEC. 602. DEFINITION OF SECRETARY.

In this title, the term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Bureau of Land Management.

Subtitle A—Elko Motocross Land Conveyance

SEC. 611. DEFINITIONS.

In this subtitle:

(1) COUNTY.—The term ''county'' means the county of Elko, Nevada.

(2) MAP.—The term ''map'' means the map entitled ''Elko Motocross Park'' and dated April 19, 2013.

SEC. 612. CONVEYANCE OF LAND TO ELKO COUNTY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, subject to valid existing rights and the provisions of this section, if requested by the county the Secretary shall convey to the county, without consideration, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the land described in subsection (b).

(b) DESCRIPTION OF LAND.—The land referred to in subsection (a) consists of approximately 275 acres of land managed by the Bureau of Land Management, Elko District, Nevada, as generally depicted on the map as ''Elko Motocross Park''.

(c) MAP AND LEGAL DESCRIPTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall finalize the legal description of the parcel to be conveyed under this section.

(2) MINOR ERRORS.—The Secretary may correct any minor error in the map or the legal description.

(3) AVAILABILITY.—The map and legal description shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the Bureau of Land Management.

(d) USE OF CONVEYED LAND.—The land conveyed under this subtitle shall be used only as a motocross, bicycle, off-highway vehicle, or stock car racing area, or for any other public purpose consistent with uses allowed under the Act of June 14, 1926 (commonly known as the ''Recreation and Public Purposes Act'') (43 U.S.C. 869 et seq.).

(e) ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.—The Secretary shall require the county to pay all survey costs and other administrative costs necessary for the preparation and completion of any patents for, and transfers of title to, the land described in subsection (b).

Subtitle B—Trust Land for Te-moak Tribe of Western Shoshone Indians of Nevada (Elko Band)

SEC. 621. LAND TO BE HELD IN TRUST FOR THE TE-MOAK TRIBE OF WESTERN SHOSHONE INDIANS OF NEVADA (ELKO BAND).

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to valid existing rights, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the land described in subsection (b)—

(1) shall be held in trust by the United States for the benefit and use of the Te-moak Tribe of Western Shoshone Indians of Nevada (Elko Band) (referred to in this subtitle as the ''Tribe''); and

(2) shall be part of the reservation of the Tribe.

(b) DESCRIPTION OF LAND.—The land referred to in subsection (a) is the approximately 373 acres of land administered by the Bureau of Land Management, as generally depicted on the map as ''Expansion Area''.

(c) MAP.—The term ''map'' means the map entitled ''Te-moak Tribal Land Expansion'', dated April 19, 2013. This map shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the Bureau of Land Management.

(d) SURVEY.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall complete a survey of the boundary lines to establish the boundaries of the land taken into trust under subsection (a).

(e) USE OF TRUST LAND.—

(1) GAMING.—Land taken into trust under subsection (a) shall not be eligible, or considered to have been taken into trust, for class II gaming or class III gaming (as those terms are defined in section 4 of the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (25 U.S.C. 2703)).

(2) GENERAL USES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Tribe shall use the land taken into trust under subsection (a) only for—

(i) traditional and customary uses;

(ii) stewardship conservation for the benefit of the Tribe; or

(iii) residential or recreational development.

(B) OTHER USES.—If the Tribe uses any portion of the land taken into trust under subsection (a) for a purpose other than a purpose described in subparagraph (A), the Tribe shall pay to the Secretary an amount that is equal to the fair market value of the portion of the land, as determined by an appraisal.

(3) THINNING; LANDSCAPE RESTORATION.—With respect to the land taken into trust under subsection (a), the Secretary, in consultation and coordination with the Tribe, may carry out any fuels reduction and other landscape restoration activities on the land that is beneficial to the Tribe and the Bureau of Land Management.

TITLE VII—NAVAL AIR STATION FALLON HOUSING AND SAFETY DEVELOPMENT ACT

SEC. 701. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Naval Air Station Fallon Housing and Safety Development Act''.

SEC. 702. TRANSFER OF DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR LAND.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall transfer to the Secretary of the Navy, without reimbursement, the Federal land described in subsection (b).

(b) DESCRIPTION OF FEDERAL LAND.—The Federal land referred to in subsection (a) is the parcel of approximately 400 acres of land under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior that—

(1) is adjacent to Naval Air Station Fallon in Churchill County, Nevada; and

(2) was withdrawn under Public Land Order 6834 (NV–943–4214–10; N–37875).

(c) MANAGEMENT.—On transfer of the Federal land described under subsection (b) to the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of the Navy

shall have full jurisdiction, custody, and control of the Federal land.

SEC. 703. WATER RIGHTS.

(a) WATER RIGHTS.—Nothing in this title shall be construed—

(1) to establish a reservation in favor of the United States with respect to any water or water right on lands transferred by this title; or

(2) to authorize the appropriation of water on lands transferred by this title except in accordance with applicable State law.

(b) EFFECT ON PREVIOUSLY ACQUIRED OR RESERVED WATER RIGHTS.—This section shall not be construed to affect any water rights acquired or reserved by the United States before the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 704. WITHDRAWAL.

Subject to valid existing rights, the Federal land to be transferred under section 702 is withdrawn from all forms of appropriation under the public land laws, including the mining laws and the mineral leasing and geothermal leasing laws, so long as the land remains under the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Navy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WENSTRUP). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5205 is a bill introduced by former Natural Resources Committee member MARK AMODEI of Nevada and is cosponsored by his three colleagues from Nevada: Mr. HECK, Mr. HORSFORD, and Ms. TITUS.

H.R. 5205 combines seven bills addressing Federal land issues in northern Nevada. This compilation prescribes the preferred or best use of these lands or addresses or resolves longstanding issues within the affected Federal areas.

It is the product of tireless negotiations with the stakeholders and the Nevada congressional delegation to reflect a broad compromise of ideas and solutions, and it provides a balanced or complementary approach to the proposed wilderness in the bill by advancing measures to create jobs and solve long-awaited problems for these northern Nevada communities.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my colleague, Mr. AMODEI, for his tireless work in bringing this bill to the floor today. For him, I know this has been a labor of love, and the State of Nevada should be proud of his accomplishments today.

I urge my colleagues to support the bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. I yield myself, Mr. Speaker, as much time as I may consume.

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5205 is a comprehensive package of bills that deals with several public lands issues in Nevada. We are pleased this package establishes nearly 40,000 acres of new wilderness and are happy to see that the majority worked across the aisle to eliminate language which concerned us.

Several of the management activities described in H.R. 5205 are limited to the existing purview of the managing agencies and as authorized by the Wilderness Act; however, this legislation contains ambiguous language that could be construed as an exception to authorize thinning in wilderness for other activities beyond wildfire mitigation.

As the West continues to dry up and the threat of wildfire increases, we recognize the importance of fire mitigation measures; nevertheless, it is the intent of Congress that any thinning activities conducted for the purpose of mitigating wildfires be carried out within the framework of the Wilderness Act in the Pine Forest Range and the Wovoka Wilderness.

It is encouraging to see the majority is willing to advance important conservation bills. I hope we can continue to work towards bipartisan conservation legislation which is of critical importance for all Americans.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I advise my friend I have another speaker, but I don't see him on the floor. Pending his arrival, I will reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. At this point, Mr. Speaker, let me yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HORSFORD), one of the supporters of the legislation.

Mr. HORSFORD. Mr. Speaker, let me thank the ranking subcommittee chairman, Mr. GRIJALVA, for his leadership and the chairman for the House Natural Resources Committee.

It is my honor to be here in support of this legislation today. With this bill, the city of Yerington, which is one key provision of this bill within this measure, will be allowed to purchase at fair market value over 10,000 acres of land from the Bureau of Land Management.

It is a very technical bill but has tremendous impacts to the State of Nevada at large. This is a true benefit for Lyon County, and it is in no way a giveaway. This project will generate between $15 to $25 million in annual revenue for Lyon County, Lyon County schools, South Lyon Hospital District, the Mason Valley Fire Protection District, and the State of Nevada.

Nevada Copper, the relevant mining company, already owns roughly 95 percent of the minerals to be mined, and it is contained on 1,500 acres of privately-held land.

We expect that the total economic impact of this development will create approximately 3,000 to 4,000 jobs when you include indirect employment. The mine itself will directly employ approximately 800 to 900 people, providing high-quality wages for nearly two decades. This is in addition to the more than 500 people who will be employed during the construction phase.

In this comprehensive development, up to 63 percent of the acquired Federal lands will be used for infrastructure, other economic development, and local recreation.

We further anticipate that the city of Yerington will be able to draw in additional economic activity due to these infrastructure investments which include power, roads, water, and sewer infrastructure; additionally, this project is environmentally sound.

In fact, the legislation includes the creation of the Wovoka Wilderness Act which will protect old growth pinyon pine and unique archeological sites and preserve this region for future generations of Nevada.

This is a commonsense bill that will create jobs for one of the most economically depressed counties in our country; and, while it took time for this legislation to move, it reminds me that with hard work, determination, and a little bipartisanship, we can get things done.

This is a bill that has unanimous support from the local community. It has unanimous support from the Federal delegation of the State of Nevada, and it passed without objection out of the House Natural Resources Committee.

Let's use the passage of a noncontroversial bill out of the House as a lesson that there is a place for Congress to help the American people. There is good that government can do, and something that appears to be a small achievement in the constellation of national politics will mean a lot to Lyon County, particularly the city of Yerington.

In addition to moving this important job-creating bill, I am looking forward to working with my colleagues to move the Tule Springs national monument bill considered for action next.

On top of the national park designation, this bill would transfer land from the BLM to the cities of Las Vegas and North Las Vegas for two 600-acre economic development zones.

It would also transfer land across the street from the southern Nevada veterans hospital. Mayor John Lee and I envision this as space for a new medical complex that could be the anchor for a new medical school in southern Nevada.

Let's keep working. We have great momentum right now. Nevadans today see that we can get things done here in Washington and Washington can solve problems; and, while today's bill is just a tiny crack in the dam of congressional gridlock, if we keep moving forward where we have consensus, we can

achieve great things for our constituents.

I want to especially thank my colleague, Representative MARK AMODEI, for all of his hard work on this important legislation. Our congressional districts both contain parts of Lyon County.

He fought hard for this bill during previous sessions of Congress. His support has been critical to getting this entire package of bills through this House, and I want to continue working with him and our entire Nevada delegation to put our State first.

I also want to thank the ranking member, Mr. DEFAZIO, for helping make this bill a top priority for our side of the aisle, as well as to the subcommittee chairman, Mr. GRIJALVA, for advocating for this bill to move quickly through the process.

Last but not least I want to thank Chairman DOC HASTINGS and the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. BISHOP, for working across the aisle and making this bill a priority.

Since I have arrived in Congress, you both have been willing to work with me on important public lands issues for my home State, and I am grateful to you both for your service and for your stability in working together on the House Natural Resources Committee.

Again, Mr. Speaker, this is an important bill that would create jobs that are desperately needed in a portion of Nevada's Fourth District, and I would like to thank this body for their consideration in passage of this important legislation.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. AMODEI), the author of this legislation.

Mr. AMODEI. Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with the remarks of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle that went before me on this measure.

I want to also say thank you to the House of Representatives for passing this bill again in the 113th Congress. It was passed in the 112th Congress.

There were concerns about not having a conservation element. It contained 75,000 acres of wilderness, 50 in Lyon County, 25,000—congratulations to the folks in Humboldt County who have worked on the pine forest bill for a long time—elements in Elko, elements in Fernley—it clears up some title problem for the folks in Virginia City dating back to the Comstock days.

I guess, now, it is appropriate since we have shown such unity on this bill in passing it out of the House twice for all eyes—for all eyes—to turn to our colleagues at the north end of the building and see what they can do with the bill that my colleague from Nevada (Mr. HORSFORD) has so eloquently described as nearly unanimous and overwhelmingly bipartisan.

Go, Senate.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I advise my friend I have no more requests for time. If the gentleman is prepared to yield back, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5205, 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.

UPPER MISSISQUOI AND TROUT WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS ACT

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2569) to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate segments of the Missisquoi River and the Trout River in the State of Vermont, as components of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2569

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 ''Upper Missisquoi and Trout Wild and Scenic Rivers Act''.

SEC. 2. DESIGNATION OF WILD AND SCENIC RIVER SEGMENTS.

Section 3(a) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1274(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(208) MISSISQUOI RIVER AND TROUT RIVER, VERMONT.—The following segments in the State of Vermont, to be administered by the Secretary of the Interior as a recreational river:

''(A) The 20.5-mile segment of the Missisquoi River from the Lowell/Westfield town line to the Canadian border in North Troy, excluding the property and project boundary of the Troy and North Troy hydroelectric facilities.

''(B) The 14.6-mile segment of the Missisquoi River from the Canadian border in Richford to the upstream project boundary of the Enosburg Falls hydroelectric facility in Sampsonville.

''(C) The 11-mile segment of the Trout River from the confluence of the Jay and Wade Brooks in Montgomery to where the Trout River joins the Missisquoi River in East Berkshire.''.

SEC. 3. MANAGEMENT.

(a) MANAGEMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The river segments designated by paragraph (208) of section 3(a) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1274(a)) shall be managed in accordance with—

(A) the Upper Missisquoi and Trout Rivers Management Plan developed during the study described in section 5(b)(19) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1276(b)(19)) (referred to in this section as the ''management plan''); and

(B) such amendments to the management plan as the Secretary determines are consistent with this Act and as are approved by the Upper Missisquoi and Trout Rivers Wild and Scenic Committee (referred to in this section as the ''Committee'').

(2) COMPREHENSIVE MANAGEMENT PLAN.—The management plan, as finalized in March 2013, and as amended, shall be considered to satisfy the requirements for a comprehensive management plan pursuant to section 3(d) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1274(d)).

(b) COMMITTEE.—The Secretary shall coordinate management responsibility of the Secretary of the Interior under this Act with the Committee, as specified in the management plan.

(c) COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In order to provide for the long-term protection, preservation, and enhancement of the river segments designated by paragraph (208) of section 3(a) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1274(a)), the Secretary of the Interior may enter into cooperative agreements pursuant to sections 10(e) and 11(b)(1) (16 U.S.C. 1281(e), 1282(b)(1)) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act with—

(A) the State of Vermont;

(B) the municipalities of Berkshire, Enosburg Falls, Enosburgh, Montgomery, North Troy, Richford, Troy, and Westfield; and

(C) appropriate local, regional, statewide, or multi-state planning or recreational organizations consistent with the management plan.

(2) CONSISTENCY.—Each cooperative agreement entered into under this section shall be consistent with the management plan and may include provisions for financial or other assistance from the United States.

(d) EFFECT ON EXISTING HYDROELECTRIC FACILITIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The designation of the river segments by paragraph (208) of section 3(a) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1274(a)), does not—

(A) preclude, prohibit, or restrict the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission from licensing, relicensing, or otherwise authorizing the operation or continued operation of the Troy Hydroelectric, North Troy, or Enosburg Falls hydroelectric project under the terms of licenses or exemptions in effect on the date of enactment of this Act; or

(B) limit modernization, upgrade, or other changes to the projects described in paragraph (1).

(2) HYDROPOWER PROCEEDINGS.—Resource protection, mitigation, or enhancement measures required by Federal Energy Regulatory Commission hydropower proceedings—

(A) shall not be considered to be project works for purposes of this Act; and

(B) may be located within the river segments designated by paragraph (208) of section 3(a) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1274(a)).

(e) LAND MANAGEMENT.—

(1) ZONING ORDINANCES.—For the purpose of the segments designated in paragraph (208) of section 3(a) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1274(a)), the zoning ordinances adopted by the towns of Berkshire, Enosburg Falls, Enosburgh, Montgomery, North Troy, Richford, Troy, and Westfield in the State of Vermont, including provisions for conservation of floodplains, wetlands, and watercourses associated with the segments, shall be considered to satisfy the standards and requirements of section 6(c) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1277(c)).

(2) ACQUISITIONS OF LAND.—The authority of the Secretary to acquire land for the purposes of the segments designated in paragraph (208) of section 3(a) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1274(a)) shall be—

(A) limited to acquisition by donation or exchange; and

(B) subject to the additional criteria set forth in the management plan.

(3) NO CONDEMNATION.—The Secretary of the Interior may not acquire by condemnation any land or interest in land within the boundaries of the river segments designated by paragraph (208) of section 3(a) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1274(a)).

(4) WRITTEN CONSENT OF OWNER REQUIRED.—No private property or non-Federal public property shall be included within the boundaries of

the river segments designated by paragraph (208) of section 3(a) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1274(a)) without the written consent of the owner of that property.

(f) RELATION TO NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM.—Notwithstanding section 10(c) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1281(c)), the Missisquoi and Trout Rivers shall not be administered as part of the National Park System or be subject to regulations that govern the National Park System.

(g) NO BUFFER ZONE CREATED.—Nothing in this Act or the Upper Missisquoi and Trout Rivers Management Plan shall be construed to create buffer zones outside the designated river segment boundaries designated by paragraph (208) of section 3(a) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1274(a)). That activities or uses can be seen, heard, or detected from areas within the designated river segments shall not preclude, limit, control, regulate or determine the conduct of management of activities or uses outside those designated river segments.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2569 designates in the State of Vermont two segments of the upper Missisquoi River and the entire main stem of its tributary, the Trout River, as part of the Wild and Scenic Rivers System.

In 2009, Congress authorized an evaluation of these rivers; and, while the study endorses the designation proposed by H.R. 2569, it was very clear that the community does not want Federal management or ownership on or around the rivers; therefore, the river segments would be managed in accordance with the management plan prepared as a part of the study with the National Park Service being limited to coordinating administration and the management with the local community.

The management plan repeatedly emphasized that actions should be carried out on a voluntary basis down to the property owner level.

The Natural Resources Committee adopted an amendment to reinforce that this designation be voluntary in nature by requiring that property may only be included into the boundaries with written consent of the owner; additionally, Federal land acquisition may occur only by donation or exchange with condemnation specifically prohibited.

If this proposal is, indeed, locally supported or managed, there is no need for Federal coercion.

□ 1915

H.R. 2569 also excludes several hydroelectric projects from the boundaries of the designation, and the committee-adopted amendment further limits the Secretary of the Interior's influence into the ongoing and future activities of these facilities.

So I urge adoption, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2569 would designate segments of the Upper Missisquoi and Trout Rivers as recreational rivers under the National Wild and Scenic Rivers Act.

These river segments provide local Vermonters with opportunities to swim, fish, kayak, and hike and are dotted with scenic and historic sites like waterfalls and covered bridges. They would be first designated Wild and Scenic rivers. They would be the first designated Wild and Scenic rivers in Vermont. The designation is widely popular with landowners and local stakeholders.

H.R. 2569 authorizes the establishment of cooperative agreements, including financial assistance with the State of Vermont and other entities to further the long-term protection and preservation of the identified river segments.

Since much of the land along the river is private property, the designation will allow landowners to emphasize the ecological and recreational value of the river while upholding long-established property rights. Any land acquisition associated with the Wild and Scenic designation must be done by donation and accompanied by a written consent from the landowner. The bill also establishes that the river segments will not be managed as part of the National Park system.

I would like to thank and congratulate my colleague from Vermont (Mr. WELCH) for his work on this bill and on behalf of his constituents.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH), the author of the legislation.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2569, the Upper Missisquoi and Trout Wild and Scenic Rivers Act. That bill would designate those two rivers as Wild and Scenic.

We are pretty excited about this in northern Vermont. As has been said, any landowner along the way is going to give permission in order for it to be part of it. Also, before this even was brought to a legislative committee, town meetings in all of the towns along the designation area had discussions in their town halls and, at town meeting, voted and requested that this designation be given.

So what we have to show that there really is excitement about this in Vermont is a town vote, and then we have got it built into the legislation that the landowner who is directly affected has to give permission. So those are good safeguards, and as the chairman said, it means that there is no Federal coercion. It is a reflection of local desire. So thank you for that.

These rivers are really beautiful. I hope in your time off, Mr. Chairman, when you don't have the burden of this committee and this duty, you might come on up and take a look.

As Mr. GRIJALVA said, these rivers flow through beautiful farm fields and valley floors in northern Vermont. They go under covered bridges and through small villages on the way to Lake Champlain, and they have served in Vermont as important routes of early trade, sources of water and food for local farming communities, and sites for some of the best recreational opportunities in the country.

The community members just love these rivers. They enjoy the recreational activity they provide, especially canoeing and kayaking. There is a lot of fishing and hunting, swimming and hiking, wildlife viewing. It is a place where folks bring their kids, teach them how to swim, teach them about nature, teach them about fishing.

So they also connect up to a canoe trail that spans the entire northern New England States. Having that web of rivers that flow one to the other accessible is enhanced with this legislation.

The Wild and Scenic designation, as has been mentioned, would recognize that these waterways do have exceptional recreational value, something that local proponents have known since they undertook the designation process 5 years ago.

And the folks involved—it is local farmers, town leaders, river enthusiasts—they have all had to work together, and they have had to talk and knock on doors to the folks who own property along the river. As I mentioned, voters in eight towns within the designation area strongly affirm the plan for their towns' participation in the Wild and Scenic Rivers program.

This designation is Vermont-based and locally grown. It requires no Federal land acquisition or management. It relies on those local and State and regional partnerships.

I want to thank the folks who have helped Mr. BISHOP, the chair of the subcommittee. Thank you so much for your work on this and for putting up with my pestering requests. Ranking Member DEFAZIO, thank you very much for hanging in there. Mr. GRIJALVA, thank you.

But I also want to especially thank, on behalf of the State of Vermont, the citizens of Berkshire, Enosburg, Enosburg Falls, Montgomery, Richford, Troy, North Troy, and Westfield. They worked hard in this, and it means a lot to them.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I hope I am not violating any rule of the House, but I want to say something personal about the man from Washington, my former colleague on the Rules Committee. I am going to accuse him of being a good guy. He worked hard on the Rules Committee when I was there. He worked hard in his responsibility as chairman of this committee.

You have worked hard for many years serving the people of your district and the people of this country over all your years in Congress, and I want to thank you that one of your last acts is a generous shepherding of this legislation that means so much to the folks in northern Vermont.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I have no more requests for time and I am prepared to close now. I will have to close after those last remarks.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

I want to thank my friend from Vermont for those nice words.

But let me speak to this legislation, because the gentleman correctly mentioned—and this has always been a concern of those of us that have been somewhat critical of Wild and Scenic designations—that it does impact local communities and local private property rights. And this legislation here, in working with you, the gentleman recognizes that. I think, at least from your debate on the floor, your citizens, your constituents, recognize that also at the town meetings. That is a win-win from my standpoint.

So I think this is good legislation. I hope the other body takes it up intact and we can pass it and sign it into law.

I do want to thank my friend from Vermont for his kind words, and with that, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2569, 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.

FLUSHING REMONSTRANCE STUDY ACT

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3222) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study of sites associated with the 1657 signing of the Flushing Remonstrance in Queens, New York, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3222

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 ''Flushing Remonstrance Study Act''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Dutch involvement in North America started with Henry Hudson's 1609 voyage on the ship, Half Moon, employed by the Dutch East India Company.

(2) After 1640, New Netherland gradually began to transform from a chain of trading posts into a settlement colony.

(3) As Dutch and English settlers moved closer to one another, they began to assimilate in what would later become Queens County.

(4) The Dutch and English settlements had not been without conflict. Although the Dutch Republic was well known for its toleration of other faiths, Director General Peter Stuyvesant and his council thought that liberty of worship should not be granted to Quakers.

(5) When Quakers began to arrive in Flushing, the colonial government issued an ordinance that formally banned the practice of all religions outside of the Dutch Reformed Church.

(6) On December 27, 1657, 30 Flushing residents signed what was later called the Flushing Remonstrance, objecting to this order. None of the remonstrance's authors were Quakers.

(7) Dutch colonial authorities proceeded to arrest the signers of the Flushing Remonstrance. In 1662, John Bowne defied the ban and allowed Quakers to hold services in his house. Bowne was fined and banished to the Dutch Republic for showing contempt for secular authority.

(8) Bowne was later exonerated after appealing to the guarantees of religious liberty before the Dutch West India Company and returned to Flushing in 1664. The colony later fell to British control on September 24, 1664.

(9) The Flushing Remonstrance is now considered by many to be instrumental in the development of religious liberty in the United States and a precursor to the First Amendment to the United States Constitution.

(10) In 1957, the United States Postal Service released a 3-cent postage stamp commemorating the 300th Anniversary of the signing of the Flushing Remonstrance which read, ''Religious Freedom in America''.

(11) Queens remained rural and agricultural through the 18th and 19th Centuries. Although its Dutch identity diminished, the tolerance of diversity that has harbored Quakers and other religious sects in the Dutch Colonial period continues to this day. Queens is the most ethnically diverse urban area in the world, with a population of over 2,200,000 representing over 100 different nations and speaking over 138 different languages.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

As used in this Act:

(1) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Interior.

(2) STUDY AREA.—The term ''study area'' means the John Bowne House located at 3701 Bowne Street, Queens, New York, the Friends Meeting House located at 137–17 Northern Boulevard, Queens, New York, and other resources in the vicinity of Flushing related to the history of religious freedom during the era of the signing of the Flushing Remonstrance.

SEC. 4. SPECIAL RESOURCE STUDY.

(a) STUDY.—The Secretary shall conduct a special resource study of the study area.

(b) CONTENTS.—In conducting the study under subsection (a), the Secretary shall—

(1) evaluate the national significance of the study area's resources based on their relationship to the history of religious freedom associated with the signing of the Flushing Remonstrance;

(2) determine the suitability and feasibility of designating resources within the study area as a unit of the National Park System;

(3) consider other alternatives for preservation, protection, and interpretation of the study area by Federal, State, or local governmental entities, or private and nonprofit organizations;

(4) identify properties related to the John Bowne House that could potentially meet criteria for designation as a National Historic Landmark;

(5) consult with interested Federal, State, or local governmental entities, private and nonprofit organizations, or any other interested individuals;

(6) evaluate the impact of the proposed action on the flow of commerce and commercial activity, job opportunities, and any adverse economic effects that could not be avoided if the proposal is implemented;

(7) identify cost estimates for any Federal acquisition, development, interpretation, operation, and maintenance associated with the alternatives;

(8) analyze the effect of the designation of the study area as a unit of the National Park System on—

(A) existing recreational activities, and on the authorization, construction, operation, maintenance, or improvement of energy production and transmission infrastructure; and

(B) the authority of State and local governments to manage those activities; and

(9) identify any authorities, including condemnation, that will compel or permit the Secretary to influence or participate in local land use decisions (such as zoning) or place restrictions on non-Federal lands if the study area is designated a unit of the National Park System.

(c) NOTIFICATION OF PRIVATE PROPERTY OWNERS.—Upon the commencement of the study, owners of private property in or adjacent to the study area shall be notified of the study's commencement and scope.

(d) APPLICABLE LAW.—The study required under subsection (a) shall be conducted in accordance with section 8(c)) of the National Park System General Authorities Act (16 U.S.C. 1a–5(c)).

(e) REPORT.—Not later than 3 years after the date on which funds are first made available for the study under subsection (a), the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate a report containing the results of the study and any conclusions and recommendations of the Secretary.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3222 authorizes a special resource study to determine the suitability and feasibility of creating a

National Park unit in Queens, New York, from those resources associated with the history of religious freedom and the signing of the Flushing Remonstrance.

The Flushing Remonstrance was a 1657 petition to the director general of New Netherland in which several citizens requested an exemption to his ban on Quaker worship. It was recognized as a forerunner to the First Amendment to the Constitution and one of the earliest demands for freedom of religion in what became the United States.

The study would evaluate and provide different Federal, local, and nongovernmental management proposals. The study is informational. Congress would still have to act on separate legislation to create such a designation.

I urge passage, and with that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Let me associate myself with Chairman HASTINGS' comments and introduction and support for H.R. 3222. This legislation would acknowledge and begin the process of studying and protecting a valuable resource and a historic resource for this country, and I appreciate his comments.

I reserve the balance my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I will reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, let me at this point yield as much time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. MENG), the sponsor and author of the legislation.

Ms. MENG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of my legislation, the Flushing Remonstrance Study Act, H.R. 3222. This bill directs the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study of the Flushing Remonstrance and significant local resources.

The Flushing Remonstrance is not only an important part of my local history, but also a significant event in our Nation's history. The Flushing Remonstrance is recognized as a precursor to the First Amendment and our Nation's commitment to the freedom of religion. During these troubling times in which religious freedom is not a globally recognized right, it is especially important to remember the history of our great Nation and the heroic actions taken by those before us to ensure individual liberty.

In the mid-17th century, the Quakers residing in New Netherland, an area including parts of what is now New York State, were not allowed to observe their religious traditions and practices. In response to this injustice, a group of local non-Quaker activists wrote the Flushing Remonstrance as a declaration against religious persecution in an attempt to allow the free practice of one's religion. It was met with great opposition from the local government, and an effective ban on specific practices was enforced.

John Bowne arrived in New Netherland during this time and proceeded to hold Quaker meetings in his home despite the political repercussions. He was eventually arrested, fined, and deported. He made his way to Holland and appealed to the Dutch West India Company for the religious liberty granted to New Netherland in its charter. John's appeal was accepted, and the company demanded that religious persecution end in the colony.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Flushing Remonstrance is historically significant and will benefit from further study and that its associated location, such as the John Bowne home and the Quaker Meeting House, deserve more national recognition. If signed into law, the Park Service would work with all stakeholders to find the best path forward to include these important locations in the National Park system.

The story of the Flushing Remonstrance is not for New Yorkers alone. It was an early struggle to establish the fundamental right to practice one's religion, but each demand for tolerance ultimately paved the way for the First Amendment, which protects our religious freedom today.

I stand today in strong support of my bill, the Flushing Remonstrance Study Act, and hope it will help us all remember the courage of John Bowne and the passion for religious freedom held by the authors of the Flushing Remonstrance.

I would also like to thank Chairman HASTINGS for his leadership and guidance, Ranking Member DEFAZIO and Congressmember GRIJALVA for their support, Congressman RUSH HOLT for cosponsoring the bill, and all the staff on their work and support of this bill.

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

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

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3222, the Flushing Remonstrance Study Act introduced by Representative GRACE MENG from New York, representing the borough of Queens.

H.R. 3222 would direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study to determine the feasibility of including sites associated with the signing of the Flushing Remonstrance in 1657 as units of the National Park Service.

These sites include the John Bowne House and the Old Quaker Meetinghouse in Flushing, Queens which are associated with the history of religious freedom in America and the signing of the Flushing Remonstrance.

The Flushing Remonstrance was a 1657 petition to Director-General of New Netherland, in which several citizens requested an exemption to the Director-General's ban on Quaker worship.

While the signers of the Flushing Remonstrance didn't know it at the time, this petition is today recognized as a precursor of the First Amendment of the Constitution and one of the earliest demands for freedom of religion in what became the United States.

The Quaker's who chose to practice their religion as well as those who volunteered their homes for Quaker meetings, such as John Bowne, were jailed. Bowne, whose home had been the place where the Flushing Remonstrance was signed, was actually banished from the colony.

On his trip back to Europe, Bowne carried with him an account of the case which he eventually presented before the Dutch West India Company. The reply established religious liberty in the colony and stated that "The consciences of men at least ought ever to remain free and unshackled."

Located a few blocks away from the Old Quaker Meetinghouse, the Bowne house has changed little since 1680. However, the concepts of freedom of religion and freedom of speech that were established in the Flushing Remonstrance have continued to evolve as our country and our influence around the world has grown.

I think it is vital that citizens and politicians alike recognize the importance of freedom of speech and political activism in our country.

I hope that the continued preservation of these historic places will serve as a reminder to all Americans of the fights that resulted in the rights we enjoy in this country today, as well as those around the world that continue to fight for their own right to speak freely and practice their religion without fear of persecution or consequence.

I applaud Rep. MENG for her advocacy and urge support for H.R. 3222.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3222, 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.

□ 1930

WEST HUNTER STREET BAPTIST CHURCH STUDY ACT

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4119) to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study of the West Hunter Street Baptist Church in Atlanta, Georgia, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4119

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 ''West Hunter Street Baptist Church Study Act''.

SEC. 2. SPECIAL RESOURCE STUDY.

(a) STUDY.—The Secretary of the Interior shall conduct a special resource study of the historic West Hunter Street Baptist Church, located at 775 Martin Luther King Jr. Drive, SW., Atlanta, Georgia and the block on which the church is located.

(b) CONTENTS.—In conducting the study under subsection (a), the Secretary shall—

(1) evaluate the national significance of the site;

(2) determine the suitability and feasibility of designating the area as a unit of the National Park System;

(3) consider other alternatives for preservation, protection, and interpretation of the site by Federal, State, or local governmental entities, or private and nonprofit organizations;

(4) consult with interested Federal, State, or local governmental entities, private and nonprofit organizations or any other interested individuals;

(5) identify cost estimates for any Federal acquisition, development, interpretation, operation, and maintenance associated with the alternatives;

(6) consider the effect of the designation of the study area as a unit of the National Park System on—

(A) existing commercial and recreational activities, including but not limited to hunting, fishing, and recreational shooting, and on the authorization, construction, operation, maintenance, or improvement of energy production and transmission infrastructure; and

(B) the authority of State and local governments to manage those activities.

(7) identify any authorities, including condemnation, that will compel or permit the Secretary to influence or participate in local land use decisions (such as zoning) or place restrictions on non-Federal lands if the study area is designated a unit of the National Park System.

(c) NOTIFICATION OF PRIVATE PROPERTY OWNERS.—Upon commencement of the study, owners of private property adjacent to the area will be notified of the study's commencement and scope.

(d) APPLICABLE LAW.—The study required under subsection (a) shall be conducted in accordance with the National Park System General Authorities Act (16 U.S.C. 1a-5(c)).

(e) REPORT.—Not later than 3 years after the date on which funds are first made available for the study under subsection (a), the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate a report containing the results of the study and any conclusions and recommendations of the Secretary.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. 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 Washington?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, during the civil rights movement, the West Hunter Street Baptist Church became a center for the movement. It was the site of many civil rights gatherings, strategy sessions, and nonviolent resolution trainings. The church was also the site of leadership meetings and doubled as a school for nonviolent protest during initiatives such as the Voter Education Project and the Freedom Summer of 1964.

H.R. 4119 directs the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study of the West Hunter Street Baptist Church in Atlanta, Georgia, to determine whether it meets the National Park Service's criteria for inclusion in the National Park System.

I urge its passage, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

H.R. 4119 will authorize the National Park Service to study the feasibility of including the West Hunter Street Baptist Church as a unit of the National Park Service.

The West Hunter Street Baptist Church served as an important gathering center and site, an organizing, training, and strategy place where leaders met, and a leadership development area, all during the civil rights movement, and it became a place where many of the most important initiatives during the fight for equality, such as the Voter Education Project and the Freedom Summer of 1964, were born.

I want to applaud my colleague from Georgia, Congressman JOHNSON, for his efforts to preserve this iconic building and hope the feasibility study is the first step in permanently preserving a landmark for future generations of Americans.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT), the cosponsor of the legislation.

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I, along with my colleague from Georgia, Mr. JOHNSON, am pleased to offer H.R. 4119, the West Hunter Street Baptist Church Study Act.

During the civil rights movement, the church served as a headquarters for many workers and a meeting ground for leaders.

The West Hunter Street Baptist Church served as a spiritual refuge for countless men and women, like our colleague, JOHN LEWIS, who devoted their lives to the civil rights movement.

I ask my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON), my friend and cosponsor of the legislation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, tonight, I rise to urge the House to adopt H.R. 4119, the West Hunter Street Baptist Church Study Act.

Mr. Speaker, this is a noncontroversial and bipartisan piece of legislation. I was proud to introduce this bill in partnership with my colleague and fellow Georgian, Congressman AUSTIN SCOTT.

My bill has the support of both of Georgia's Republican U.S. Senators and 77 bipartisan Members of the House of Representatives.

This is an important piece of legislation for the people of Georgia's Fourth Congressional District, whom I represent, but also for the thousands of heroes who fought tirelessly during the civil rights movement for equality in the South and throughout the country.

The West Hunter Street Baptist Church Study Act authorizes the Department of the Interior to conduct a study of the West Hunter Street Baptist Church in Atlanta, Georgia, to determine if it meets the requirements to become part of our Nation's park system. According to the National Park Service, the site may be considered for designation as a national park if it is associated with significant events and people in our Nation's history and contributes to the understanding of these historic events and figures.

During the civil rights movement, the West Hunter Street Baptist Church served as the headquarters for many civil rights workers and organizers. It was the site of many important leadership meetings and doubled as a school for nonviolent protests during initiatives such as the Voter Education Project and the Freedom Summer of 1964. It was also a spiritual refuge for the countless men and women who devoted their lives to the cause.

Rev. Dr. Ralph David Abernathy, Sr., the church's pastor, was the best friend and a partner of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. He helped lead the bus boycotts after Rosa Parks famously refused to give up her seat. Rev. Dr. Abernathy, Sr. assumed his position at the church at Dr. King's urging following the success of the Freedom Rides. He was the pastor at West Hunter Street Baptist Church until his death in 1990.

Passage of this bill will allow the Department of Interior to assess how to more fully preserve and honor the contributions of all who played significant roles in advancing freedom and human rights, including the Rev. Dr. Ralph David Abernathy, Sr.

I urge the House to remember the pivotal nature of the civil rights movement. When considering this bill, think of what the movement meant to our Nation and to the world. As Dr. King said, the struggle for civil rights ''lifted our Nation from the quicksands of racial injustice to the solid rock of brotherhood.''

In addition to broad bipartisan support in the House, this bill enjoys the support of a number of prominent organizations, including the Coalition for the People's Agenda, the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, and the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

I would like to thank Chairman HASTINGS and Ranking Member DEFAZIO and Subcommittee Chairman BISHOP and Ranking Member GRIJALVA for their support of this bill, and I thank them for moving this bill through the Natural Resources Committee.

Again, I want to thank my colleague and homeboy, AUSTIN SCOTT, for his work on this.

I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan bill.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I advise my friend from Arizona I have no more requests for time, so I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. 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 Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4119, 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.

PROMOTING JOB CREATION AND REDUCING SMALL BUSINESS BURDENS ACT

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5405) to make technical corrections to the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, to enhance the ability of small and emerging growth companies to access capital through public and private markets, to reduce regulatory burdens, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5405

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 ''Promoting Job Creation and Reducing Small Business Burdens Act''.

SEC. 2. TABLE OF CONTENTS.

The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

TITLE I—BUSINESS RISK MITIGATION AND PRICE STABILIZATION ACT

SEC. 101. MARGIN REQUIREMENTS.

(a) COMMODITY EXCHANGE ACT AMENDMENT.—Section 4s(e) of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 6s(e)), as added by section 731 of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(4) APPLICABILITY WITH RESPECT TO COUNTERPARTIES.—The requirements of paragraphs (2)(A)(ii) and (2)(B)(ii), including the initial and variation margin requirements imposed by rules adopted pursuant to paragraphs (2)(A)(ii) and (2)(B)(ii), shall not apply to a swap in which a counterparty qualifies for an exception under section 2(h)(7)(A), or an exemption issued under section 4(c)(1) from the requirements of section 2(h)(1)(A) for cooperative entities as defined in such exemption, or satisfies the criteria in section 2(h)(7)(D).''.

(b) SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT AMENDMENT.—Section 15F(e) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78o–10(e)), as added by section 764(a) of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(4) APPLICABILITY WITH RESPECT TO COUNTERPARTIES.—The requirements of paragraphs (2)(A)(ii) and (2)(B)(ii) shall not apply to a security-based swap in which a counterparty qualifies for an exception under section 3C(g)(1) or satisfies the criteria in section 3C(g)(4).''.

SEC. 102. IMPLEMENTATION.

The amendments made by this title to the Commodity Exchange Act shall be implemented—

(1) without regard to—

(A) chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code; and

(B) the notice and comment provisions of section 553 of title 5, United States Code;

(2) through the promulgation of an interim final rule, pursuant to which public comment will be sought before a final rule is issued; and

(3) such that paragraph (1) shall apply solely to changes to rules and regulations, or proposed rules and regulations, that are limited to and directly a consequence of such amendments.

TITLE II—TREATMENT OF AFFILIATE TRANSACTIONS

SEC. 201. TREATMENT OF AFFILIATE TRANSACTIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) COMMODITY EXCHANGE ACT AMENDMENT.—Section 2(h)(7)(D)(i) of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 2(h)(7)(D)(i)) is amended to read as follows:

''(i) IN GENERAL.—An affiliate of a person that qualifies for an exception under subparagraph (A) (including affiliate entities predominantly engaged in providing financing for the purchase of the merchandise or manufactured goods of the person) may qualify for the exception only if the affiliate enters into the swap to hedge or mitigate the commercial risk of the person or other affiliate of the person that is not a financial entity, provided that if the transfer of commercial risk is addressed by entering into a swap with a swap dealer or major swap participant, an appropriate credit support measure or other mechanism is utilized.''.

(2) SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934 AMENDMENT.—Section 3C(g)(4)(A) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78c–3(g)(4)(A)) is amended to read as follows:

''(A) IN GENERAL.—An affiliate of a person that qualifies for an exception under paragraph (1) (including affiliate entities predominantly engaged in providing financing for the purchase of the merchandise or manufactured goods of the person) may qualify for the exception only if the affiliate enters into the security-based swap to hedge or mitigate the commercial risk of the person or other affiliate of the person that is not a financial entity, provided that if the transfer of commercial risk is addressed by entering into a security-based swap with a security-based swap dealer or major security-based swap participant, an appropriate credit support measure or other mechanism is utilized.''.

(b) APPLICABILITY OF CREDIT SUPPORT MEASURE REQUIREMENT.—Notwithstanding section 371 of this Act, the requirements in section 2(h)(7)(D)(i) of the Commodity Exchange Act and section 3C(g)(4)(A) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended by subsection (a), requiring that a credit support measure or other mechanism be utilized if the transfer of commercial risk referred to in such sections is addressed by entering into a swap with a swap dealer or major swap participant or a security-based swap with a security-based swap dealer or major security-based swap participant, as appropriate, shall not apply with respect to swaps or security-based swaps, as appropriate, entered into before the date of the enactment of this Act.

TITLE III—HOLDING COMPANY REGISTRATION THRESHOLD EQUALIZATION ACT

SEC. 301. REGISTRATION THRESHOLD FOR SAVINGS AND LOAN HOLDING COMPANIES.

The Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78a et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 12(g)—

(A) in paragraph (1)(B), by inserting after ''is a bank'' the following: '', a savings and loan holding company (as defined in section 10 of the Home Owners' Loan Act),''; and

(B) in paragraph (4), by inserting after ''case of a bank'' the following: '', a savings and loan holding company (as defined in section 10 of the Home Owners' Loan Act),''; and

(2) in section 15(d), by striking ''case of bank'' and inserting the following: ''case of a

bank, a savings and loan holding company (as defined in section 10 of the Home Owners' Loan Act),''.

TITLE IV—SMALL BUSINESS MERGERS, ACQUISITIONS, SALES, AND BROKERAGE SIMPLIFICATION ACT

SEC. 401. REGISTRATION EXEMPTION FOR MERGER AND ACQUISITION BROKERS.

Section 15(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78o(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(13) REGISTRATION EXEMPTION FOR MERGER AND ACQUISITION BROKERS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), an M&A broker shall be exempt from registration under this section.

''(B) EXCLUDED ACTIVITIES.—An M&A broker is not exempt from registration under this paragraph if such broker does any of the following:

''(i) Directly or indirectly, in connection with the transfer of ownership of an eligible privately held company, receives, holds, transmits, or has custody of the funds or securities to be exchanged by the parties to the transaction.

''(ii) Engages on behalf of an issuer in a public offering of any class of securities that is registered, or is required to be registered, with the Commission under section 12 or with respect to which the issuer files, or is required to file, periodic information, documents, and reports under subsection (d).

''(C) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to limit any other authority of the Commission to exempt any person, or any class of persons, from any provision of this title, or from any provision of any rule or regulation thereunder.

''(D) DEFINITIONS.—In this paragraph:

''(i) CONTROL.—The term 'control' means the power, directly or indirectly, to direct the management or policies of a company, whether through ownership of securities, by contract, or otherwise. There is a presumption of control for any person who—

''(I) is a director, general partner, member or manager of a limited liability company, or officer exercising executive responsibility (or has similar status or functions);

''(II) has the right to vote 20 percent or more of a class of voting securities or the power to sell or direct the sale of 20 percent or more of a class of voting securities; or

''(III) in the case of a partnership or limited liability company, has the right to receive upon dissolution, or has contributed, 20 percent or more of the capital.

''(ii) ELIGIBLE PRIVATELY HELD COMPANY.—The term 'eligible privately held company' means a company that meets both of the following conditions:

''(I) The company does not have any class of securities registered, or required to be registered, with the Commission under section 12 or with respect to which the company files, or is required to file, periodic information, documents, and reports under subsection (d).

''(II) In the fiscal year ending immediately before the fiscal year in which the services of the M&A broker are initially engaged with respect to the securities transaction, the company meets either or both of the following conditions (determined in accordance with the historical financial accounting records of the company):

''(aa) The earnings of the company before interest, taxes, depreciation, and amortization are less than $25,000,000.

''(bb) The gross revenues of the company are less than $250,000,000.

''(iii) M&A BROKER.—The term 'M&A broker' means a broker, and any person associated with a broker, engaged in the business of effecting securities transactions solely in connection with the transfer of ownership of an eligible privately held company, regardless of whether the broker acts on behalf of a seller or buyer, through the purchase, sale, exchange, issuance, repurchase, or redemption of, or a business combination involving, securities or assets of the eligible privately held company, if the broker reasonably believes that—

''(I) upon consummation of the transaction, any person acquiring securities or assets of the eligible privately held company, acting alone or in concert, will control and, directly or indirectly, will be active in the management of the eligible privately held company or the business conducted with the assets of the eligible privately held company; and

''(II) if any person is offered securities in exchange for securities or assets of the eligible privately held company, such person will, prior to becoming legally bound to consummate the transaction, receive or have reasonable access to the most recent year-end balance sheet, income statement, statement of changes in financial position, and statement of owner's equity of the issuer of the securities offered in exchange, and, if the financial statements of the issuer are audited, the related report of the independent auditor, a balance sheet dated not more than 120 days before the date of the offer, and information pertaining to the management, business, results of operations for the period covered by the foregoing financial statements, and material loss contingencies of the issuer.

''(E) INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—On the date that is 5 years after the date of the enactment of the Small Business Mergers, Acquisitions, Sales, and Brokerage Simplification Act of 2014, and every 5 years thereafter, each dollar amount in subparagraph (D)(ii)(II) shall be adjusted by—

''(I) dividing the annual value of the Employment Cost Index For Wages and Salaries, Private Industry Workers (or any successor index), as published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, for the calendar year preceding the calendar year in which the adjustment is being made by the annual value of such index (or successor) for the calendar year ending December 31, 2012; and

''(II) multiplying such dollar amount by the quotient obtained under subclause (I).

''(ii) ROUNDING.—Each dollar amount determined under clause (i) shall be rounded to the nearest multiple of $100,000.''.

SEC. 402. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act and any amendment made by this Act shall take effect on the date that is 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

TITLE V—SMALL CAP LIQUIDITY REFORM ACT

SEC. 501. LIQUIDITY PILOT PROGRAM FOR SECURITIES OF CERTAIN EMERGING GROWTH COMPANIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 11A(c)(6) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78k–1(c)(6)) is amended to read as follows:

''(6) LIQUIDITY PILOT PROGRAM FOR SECURITIES OF CERTAIN EMERGING GROWTH COMPANIES.—

''(A) QUOTING INCREMENT.—Beginning on the date that is 90 days after the date of the enactment of the Small Cap Liquidity Reform Act of 2014, the securities of a covered emerging growth company shall be quoted using—

''(i) a minimum increment of $0.05; or

''(ii) if, not later than 60 days after such date of enactment, the company so elects in the manner described in subparagraph (D)—

''(I) a minimum increment of $0.10; or

''(II) the increment at which such securities would be quoted without regard to the minimum increments established under this paragraph.

''(B) TRADING INCREMENT.—In the case of a covered emerging growth company the securities of which are quoted at a minimum increment of $0.05 or $0.10 under this paragraph, the Commission shall determine the increment at which the securities of such company are traded.

''(C) FUTURE RIGHT TO OPT OUT OR CHANGE MINIMUM INCREMENT.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—At any time beginning on the date that is 90 days after the date of the enactment of the Small Cap Liquidity Reform Act of 2014, a covered emerging growth company the securities of which are quoted at a minimum increment of $0.05 or $0.10 under this paragraph may elect in the manner described in subparagraph (D)—

''(I) for the securities of such company to be quoted at the increment at which such securities would be quoted without regard to the minimum increments established under this paragraph; or

''(II) to change the minimum increment at which the securities of such company are quoted from $0.05 to $0.10 or from $0.10 to $0.05.

''(ii) WHEN ELECTION EFFECTIVE.—An election under this subparagraph shall take effect on the date that is 30 days after such election is made.

''(iii) SINGLE ELECTION TO CHANGE MINIMUM INCREMENT.—A covered emerging growth company may not make more than one election under clause (i)(II).

''(D) MANNER OF ELECTION.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—An election is made in the manner described in this subparagraph by informing the Commission of such election.

''(ii) NOTIFICATION OF EXCHANGES AND OTHER TRADING VENUES.—Upon being informed of an election under clause (i), the Commission shall notify each exchange or other trading venue where the securities of the covered emerging growth company are quoted or traded.

''(E) ISSUERS CEASING TO BE COVERED EMERGING GROWTH COMPANIES.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—If an issuer the securities of which are quoted at a minimum increment of $0.05 or $0.10 under this paragraph ceases to be a covered emerging growth company, the securities of such issuer shall be quoted at the increment at which such securities would be quoted without regard to the minimum increments established under this paragraph.

''(ii) EXCEPTIONS.—The Commission may by regulation, as the Commission considers appropriate, specify any circumstances under which an issuer shall continue to be considered a covered emerging growth company for purposes of this paragraph after the issuer ceases to meet the requirements of subparagraph (L)(i).

''(F) SECURITIES TRADING BELOW $1.—

''(i) INITIAL PRICE.—

''(I) AT EFFECTIVE DATE.—If the trading price of the securities of a covered emerging growth company is below $1 at the close of the last trading day before the date that is 90 days after the date of the enactment of the Small Cap Liquidity Reform Act of 2014, the securities of such company shall be quoted using the increment at which such securities would be quoted without regard to the minimum increments established under this paragraph.

''(II) AT IPO.—If a covered emerging growth company makes an initial public offering after the day described in subclause (I) and the first share of the securities of such company is offered to the public at a price below $1, the securities of such company shall be quoted using the increment at which such securities would be quoted without regard to

the minimum increments established under this paragraph.

''(ii) AVERAGE TRADING PRICE.—If the average trading price of the securities of a covered emerging growth company falls below $1 for any 90-day period beginning on or after the day before the date of the enactment of the Small Cap Liquidity Reform Act of 2014, the securities of such company shall, after the end of such period, be quoted using the increment at which such securities would be quoted without regard to the minimum increments established under this paragraph.

''(G) FRAUD OR MANIPULATION.—If the Commission determines that a covered emerging growth company has violated any provision of the securities laws prohibiting fraudulent, manipulative, or deceptive acts or practices, the securities of such company shall, after the date of the determination, be quoted using the increment at which such securities would be quoted without regard to the minimum increments established under this paragraph.

''(H) INELIGIBILITY FOR INCREASED MINIMUM INCREMENT PERMANENT.—The securities of an issuer may not be quoted at a minimum increment of $0.05 or $0.10 under this paragraph at any time after—

''(i) such issuer makes an election under subparagraph (A)(ii)(II);

''(ii) such issuer makes an election under subparagraph (C)(i)(I), except during the period before such election takes effect; or

''(iii) the securities of such issuer are required by this paragraph to be quoted using the increment at which such securities would be quoted without regard to the minimum increments established under this paragraph.

''(I) ADDITIONAL REPORTS AND DISCLOSURES.—The Commission shall require a covered emerging growth company the securities of which are quoted at a minimum increment of $0.05 or $0.10 under this paragraph to make such reports and disclosures as the Commission considers necessary or appropriate in the public interest or for the protection of investors.

''(J) LIMITATION OF LIABILITY.—An issuer (or any officer, director, manager, or other agent of such issuer) shall not be liable to any person (other than such issuer) under any law or regulation of the United States, any constitution, law, or regulation of any State or political subdivision thereof, or any contract or other legally enforceable agreement (including any arbitration agreement) for any losses caused solely by the quoting of the securities of such issuer at a minimum increment of $0.05 or $0.10, by the trading of such securities at the increment determined by the Commission under subparagraph (B), or by both such quoting and trading, as provided in this paragraph.

''(K) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 6 months after the date of the enactment of the Small Cap Liquidity Reform Act of 2014, and every 6 months thereafter, the Commission, in coordination with each exchange on which the securities of covered emerging growth companies are quoted or traded, shall submit to Congress a report on the quoting and trading of securities in increments permitted by this paragraph and the extent to which such quoting and trading are increasing liquidity and active trading by incentivizing capital commitment, research coverage, and brokerage support, together with any legislative recommendations the Commission may have.

''(L) DEFINITIONS.—In this paragraph:

''(i) COVERED EMERGING GROWTH COMPANY.—The term 'covered emerging growth company' means an emerging growth company, as defined in the first paragraph (80) of section 3(a), except that—

''(I) such paragraph shall be applied by substituting '$750,000,000' for '$1,000,000,000' each place it appears; and

''(II) subparagraphs (B), (C), and (D) of such paragraph do not apply.

''(ii) SECURITY.—The term 'security' means an equity security.

''(M) SAVINGS PROVISION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this paragraph, the Commission may—

''(i) make such adjustments to the pilot program specified in this paragraph as the Commission considers necessary or appropriate to ensure that such program can provide statistically meaningful or reliable results, including adjustments to eliminate selection bias among participants, expand the number of participants eligible to participate in such program, and change the duration of such program for one or more participants; and

''(ii) conduct any other study or pilot program, in conjunction with or separate from the pilot program specified in this paragraph (as such program may be adjusted pursuant to clause (i)), to evaluate quoting or trading in various minimum increments.''.

(b) SUNSET.—Effective on the date that is 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, section 11A(c)(6) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78k–1(c)(6)) is repealed.

TITLE VI—IMPROVING ACCESS TO CAPITAL FOR EMERGING GROWTH COMPANIES ACT

SEC. 601. FILING REQUIREMENT FOR PUBLIC FILING PRIOR TO PUBLIC OFFERING.

Section 6(e)(1) of the Securities Act of 1933 (15 U.S.C. 77f(e)(1)) is amended by striking ''21 days'' and inserting ''15 days''.

SEC. 602. GRACE PERIOD FOR CHANGE OF STATUS OF EMERGING GROWTH COMPANIES.

Section 6(e)(1) of the Securities Act of 1933 (15 U.S.C. 77f(e)(1)) is further amended by adding at the end the following: ''An issuer that was an emerging growth company at the time it submitted a confidential registration statement or, in lieu thereof, a publicly filed registration statement for review under this subsection but ceases to be an emerging growth company thereafter shall continue to be treated as an emerging market growth company for the purposes of this subsection through the earlier of the date on which the issuer consummates its initial public offering pursuant to such registrations statement or the end of the 1-year period beginning on the date the company ceases to be an emerging growth company.''

SEC. 603. SIMPLIFIED DISCLOSURE REQUIREMENTS FOR EMERGING GROWTH COMPANIES.

Section 102 of the Jumpstart Our Business Startups Act (Public Law 112–106) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(d) SIMPLIFIED DISCLOSURE REQUIREMENTS.—With respect to an emerging growth company (as such term is defined under section 2 of the Securities Act of 1933):

''(1) REQUIREMENT TO INCLUDE NOTICE ON FORM S–1.—Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Securities and Exchange Commission shall revise its general instructions on Form S–1 to indicate that a registration statement filed (or submitted for confidential review) by an issuer prior to an initial public offering may omit financial information for historical periods otherwise required by regulation S–X (17 C.F.R. 210.1–01 et seq.) as of the time of filing (or confidential submission) of such registration statement, provided that—

''(A) the omitted financial information relates to a historical period that the issuer reasonably believes will not be required to be included in the Form S–1 at the time of the contemplated offering; and

''(B) prior to the issuer distributing a preliminary prospectus to investors, such registration statement is amended to include all financial information required by such regulation S–X at the date of such amendment.

''(2) RELIANCE BY ISSUERS.—Effective 30 days after the date of enactment of this subsection, an issuer filing a registration statement (or submitting the statement for confidential review) on Form S–1 may omit financial information for historical periods otherwise required by regulation S–X (17 C.F.R. 210.1–01 et seq.) as of the time of filing (or confidential submission) of such registration statement, provided that—

''(A) the omitted financial information relates to a historical period that the issuer reasonably believes will not be required to be included in the Form S–1 at the time of the contemplated offering; and

''(B) prior to the issuer distributing a preliminary prospectus to investors, such registration statement is amended to include all financial information required by such regulation S–X at the date of such amendment.''.

TITLE VII—SMALL COMPANY DISCLOSURE SIMPLIFICATION ACT

SEC. 701. EXEMPTION FROM XBRL REQUIREMENTS FOR EMERGING GROWTH COMPANIES AND OTHER SMALLER COMPANIES.

(a) EXEMPTION FOR EMERGING GROWTH COMPANIES.—Emerging growth companies are exempted from the requirements to use Extensible Business Reporting Language (XBRL) for financial statements and other periodic reporting required to be filed with the Commission under the securities laws. Such companies may elect to use XBRL for such reporting.

(b) EXEMPTION FOR OTHER SMALLER COMPANIES.—Issuers with total annual gross revenues of less than $250,000,000 are exempt from the requirements to use XBRL for financial statements and other periodic reporting required to be filed with the Commission under the securities laws. Such issuers may elect to use XBRL for such reporting. An exemption under this subsection shall continue in effect until—

(1) the date that is five years after the date of enactment of this Act; or

(2) the date that is two years after a determination by the Commission, by order after conducting the analysis required by section 702, that the benefits of such requirements to such issuers outweigh the costs, but no earlier than three years after enactment of this Act.

(c) MODIFICATIONS TO REGULATIONS.—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commission shall revise its regulations under parts 229, 230, 232, 239, 240, and 249 of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations, to reflect the exemptions set forth in subsections (a) and (b).

SEC. 702. ANALYSIS BY THE SEC.

The Commission shall conduct an analysis of the costs and benefits to issuers described in section 701(b) of the requirements to use XBRL for financial statements and other periodic reporting required to be filed with the Commission under the securities laws. Such analysis shall include an assessment of—

(1) how such costs and benefits may differ from the costs and benefits identified by the Commission in the order relating to interactive data to improve financial reporting (dated January 30, 2009; 74 Fed. Reg. 6776) because of the size of such issuers;

(2) the effects on efficiency, competition, capital formation, and financing and on analyst coverage of such issuers (including any such effects resulting from use of XBRL by investors);

(3) the costs to such issuers of—

(A) submitting data to the Commission in XBRL;

(B) posting data on the website of the issuer in XBRL;

(C) software necessary to prepare, submit, or post data in XBRL; and

(D) any additional consulting services or filing agent services;

(4) the benefits to the Commission in terms of improved ability to monitor securities markets, assess the potential outcomes of regulatory alternatives, and enhance investor participation in corporate governance and promote capital formation; and

(5) the effectiveness of standards in the United States for interactive filing data relative to the standards of international counterparts.

SEC. 703. REPORT TO CONGRESS.

Not later than one year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commission shall provide the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate a report regarding—

(1) the progress in implementing XBRL reporting within the Commission;

(2) the use of XBRL data by Commission officials;

(3) the use of XBRL data by investors;

(4) the results of the analysis required by section 702; and

(5) any additional information the Commission considers relevant for increasing transparency, decreasing costs, and increasing efficiency of regulatory filings with the Commission.

SEC. 704. DEFINITIONS.

As used in this title, the terms ''Commission'', ''emerging growth company'', ''issuer'', and ''securities laws'' have the meanings given such terms in section 3 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78c).

TITLE VIII—RESTORING PROVEN FINANCING FOR AMERICAN EMPLOYERS ACT

SEC. 801. RULES OF CONSTRUCTION RELATING TO COLLATERALIZED LOAN OBLIGATIONS.

Section 13(g) of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 (12 U.S.C. 1851(g)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

''(4) COLLATERALIZED LOAN OBLIGATIONS.—

''(A) INAPPLICABILITY TO CERTAIN COLLATERALIZED LOAN OBLIGATIONS.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to require the divestiture, prior to July 21, 2017, of any debt securities of collateralized loan obligations, if such debt securities were issued before January 31, 2014.

''(B) OWNERSHIP INTEREST WITH RESPECT TO COLLATERALIZED LOAN OBLIGATIONS.—A banking entity shall not be considered to have an ownership interest in a collateralized loan obligation because it acquires, has acquired, or retains a debt security in such collateralized loan obligation if the debt security has no indicia of ownership other than the right of the banking entity to participate in the removal for cause, or in the selection of a replacement after removal for cause or resignation, of an investment manager or investment adviser of the collateralized loan obligation.

''(C) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this paragraph:

''(i) COLLATERALIZED LOAN OBLIGATION.—The term 'collateralized loan obligation' means any issuing entity of an asset-backed security, as defined in section 3(a)(77) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78c(a)(77)), that is comprised primarily of commercial loans.

''(ii) REMOVAL FOR CAUSE.—An investment manager or investment adviser shall be deemed to be removed 'for cause' if the investment manager or investment adviser is removed as a result of—

''(I) a breach of a material term of the applicable management or advisory agreement or the agreement governing the collateralized loan obligation;

''(II) the inability of the investment manager or investment adviser to continue to perform its obligations under any such agreement;

''(III) any other action or inaction by the investment manager or investment adviser that has or could reasonably be expected to have a materially adverse effect on the collateralized loan obligation, if the investment manager or investment adviser fails to cure or take reasonable steps to cure such effect within a reasonable time; or

''(IV) a comparable event or circumstance that threatens, or could reasonably be expected to threaten, the interests of holders of the debt securities.''.

TITLE IX—SBIC ADVISERS RELIEF ACT

SEC. 901. ADVISERS OF SBICS AND VENTURE CAPITAL FUNDS.

Section 203(l) of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80b–3(l)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''No investment adviser'' and inserting the following:

''(1) IN GENERAL.—No investment adviser''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) ADVISERS OF SBICS.—For purposes of this subsection, a venture capital fund includes an entity described in subparagraph (A), (B), or (C) of subsection (b)(7) (other than an entity that has elected to be regulated or is regulated as a business development company pursuant to section 54 of the Investment Company Act of 1940).''.

SEC. 902. ADVISERS OF SBICS AND PRIVATE FUNDS.

Section 203(m) of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80b–3(m)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(3) ADVISERS OF SBICS.—For purposes of this subsection, the assets under management of a private fund that is an entity described in subparagraph (A), (B), or (C) of subsection (b)(7) (other than an entity that has elected to be regulated or is regulated as a business development company pursuant to section 54 of the Investment Company Act of 1940) shall be excluded from the limit set forth in paragraph (1).''.

SEC. 903. RELATIONSHIP TO STATE LAW.

Section 203A(b)(1) of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80b–3a(b)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''or'' at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (B), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; or''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(C) that is not registered under section 203 because that person is exempt from registration as provided in subsection (b)(7) of such section, or is a supervised person of such person.''.

TITLE X—DISCLOSURE MODERNIZATION AND SIMPLIFICATION ACT

SEC. 1001. SUMMARY PAGE FOR FORM 10–K.

Not later than the end of the 180-day period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the Securities and Exchange Commission shall issue regulations to permit issuers to submit a summary page on form 10–K (17 C.F.R. 249.310), but only if each item on such summary page includes a cross-reference (by electronic link or otherwise) to the material contained in form 10–K to which such item relates.

SEC. 1002. IMPROVEMENT OF REGULATION S–K.

Not later than the end of the 180-day period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the Securities and Exchange Commission shall take all such actions to revise regulation S–K (17 C.F.R. 229.10 et seq.)—

(1) to further scale or eliminate requirements of regulation S–K, in order to reduce the burden on emerging growth companies, accelerated filers, smaller reporting companies, and other smaller issuers, while still providing all material information to investors;

(2) to eliminate provisions of regulation S–K, required for all issuers, that are duplicative, overlapping, outdated, or unnecessary; and

(3) for which the Commission determines that no further study under section 1003 is necessary to determine the efficacy of such revisions to regulation S–K.

SEC. 1003. STUDY ON MODERNIZATION AND SIMPLIFICATION OF REGULATION S–K.

(a) STUDY.—The Securities and Exchange Commission shall carry out a study of the requirements contained in regulation S–K (17 C.F.R. 229.10 et seq.). Such study shall—

(1) determine how best to modernize and simplify such requirements in a manner that reduces the costs and burdens on issuers while still providing all material information;

(2) emphasize a company by company approach that allows relevant and material information to be disseminated to investors without boilerplate language or static requirements while preserving completeness and comparability of information across registrants; and

(3) evaluate methods of information delivery and presentation and explore methods for discouraging repetition and the disclosure of immaterial information.

(b) CONSULTATION.—In conducting the study required under subsection (a), the Commission shall consult with the Investor Advisory Committee and the Advisory Committee on Small and Emerging Companies.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than the end of the 360-day period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, the Commission shall issue a report to the Congress containing—

(1) all findings and determinations made in carrying out the study required under subsection (a);

(2) specific and detailed recommendations on modernizing and simplifying the requirements in regulation S–K in a manner that reduces the costs and burdens on companies while still providing all material information; and

(3) specific and detailed recommendations on ways to improve the readability and navigability of disclosure documents and to discourage repetition and the disclosure of immaterial information.

(d) RULEMAKING.—Not later than the end of the 360-day period beginning on the date that the report is issued to the Congress under subsection (c), the Commission shall issue a proposed rule to implement the recommendations of the report issued under subsection (c).

(e) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Revisions made to regulation S–K by the Commission under section 1002 shall not be construed as satisfying the rulemaking requirements under this section.

TITLE XI—ENCOURAGING EMPLOYEE OWNERSHIP ACT

SEC. 1101. INCREASED THRESHOLD FOR DISCLOSURES RELATING TO COMPENSATORY BENEFIT PLANS.

Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Securities and Exchange Commission shall revise section 230.701(e) of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations, so as to increase from $5,000,000 to $10,000,000 the aggregate sales price or amount of securities sold during any consecutive 12-month period in excess of which

the issuer is required under such section to deliver an additional disclosure to investors. The Commission shall index for inflation such aggregate sales price or amount every 5 years to reflect the change in the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, rounding to the nearest $1,000,000.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to submit extraneous materials for the RECORD on H.R. 5405, as amended, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

I am the proud sponsor, Mr. Speaker, of a package of bills we are considering this evening. This legislation contains the language of nearly a dozen jobs bills that have either passed the Financial Services Committee or have passed this House with broad bipartisan support. The Senate should immediately take up and pass this package, though recent history doesn't give us much hope. The Senate's Democratic leadership is already sitting on some 40 jobs bills, including several that we are considering here this evening.

Mr. Speaker, this is a jobs bill. By repealing and reforming burdensome regulations we can set businesses and working capital free to invest in the economy and to create jobs. For example, Wegmans, a grocery store chain that employs 44,000 people, including 8,200 in my home State of Pennsylvania, needs this regulatory relief to retain their best employees while allowing workers to invest in the company and invest in their own futures.

Biotech is an extremely important and vibrant industry in southeast Pennsylvania employing thousands and working toward treatments and cures for devastating diseases like diabetes, Alzheimer's, cancer, and HIV/AIDS. Former Representative Jim Greenwood, current president of BIO, put it this way:

> For far too long, small public companies have been hamstrung by one-size-fits-all regulations that stifle their growth. This legislation will foster innovation and stimulate groundbreaking research and development at emerging companies in Pennsylvania and across our Nation.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, there are companies in and around Bucks County, Pennsylvania, that have the resources to invest right now in small businesses. This bill will allow them to invest more of their resources in advancing American workers instead of spending money complying with needless regulations in Washington.

These are just some of the examples of how this bill provides necessary relief to those that we are counting on to power our economy as it continues to recover.

Mr. Speaker, I spent the summer touring 100 businesses in my district, and, despite my frustrations with Washington, I remain optimistic, as I know our recovery is in the right hands as long as American workers and entrepreneurs are in the driver's seat.

I want to thank the Republican and Democrat authors of the underlying language, as well as the chairman for his leadership.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation, and I hold out hope that the Senate will take action on this bill and the dozens of other jobs bills that are stacking up in their Chamber like cordwood.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today not only in opposition to this legislation but to a process that has been conducted in secret and in bad faith.

Tonight, the House will debate two legislative packages that have been brought to the floor over the objections of the minority and without regard for due process or the opportunity for robust debate.

Mr. Speaker, make no mistake: these measures are being advanced for no other reason than political gain.

The bill we consider presently is H.R. 5405, a newly created package that combines 11—11—separate Republican-authored bills. These complex and wide-ranging measures have been hastily merged together and rushed to the floor for a vote. The expedited process in which the Republicans have engaged, over my objections, have denied Members the opportunity to debate how these pieces will interact with each other and the problems that may occur as a result.

Keep in mind that H.R. 5405 is so far-reaching that it amends the Securities Act, the Commodity Exchange Act, the Securities Exchange Act, the JOBS Act, the Bank Holding Company Act, and the Investment Advisers Act, not to mention that many provisions interact with the Dodd-Frank Act.

With this omnibus proposal touching so many different aspects of our directives and securities laws, Members ought to have the chance to offer amendments on the floor and debate whether this laundry list of provisions is the right approach.

□ 1945

Again, this is a substantial piece of legislation with the package requiring three separate reports by the SEC and another robust cost-benefit analysis.

Keep in mind that the majority is placing all these new rule-writing and reporting requirements on the SEC at the same time that they are denying the Commission the funding they need to do their job efficiently and be the tough sheriff for Wall Street that we need them to be.

I, for one, oppose this last-minute attempt to circumvent the legislative process. At the eleventh hour, it seems the majority is using all the tricks at their disposal to prove to the American people that they are more than the do-nothing Republican Congress. I think the American people are smarter than that.

Again, I think the American people would agree that Members of this House should be afforded the opportunity to discuss what is in these packages, offer amendments, and have a robust debate on these bills.

Tonight, in a mad dash for political victory, that fundamental element of democracy will be thwarted; furthermore, the chairman has broken with the tradition of a bipartisan suspension vote process by putting forth more than 15 pieces of legislation in exchange for one Democratic bill. This is just unacceptable.

Unfortunately, as with flood insurance legislation, the Export-Import Bank, and the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act, the ideological wing of the Republican Party is unable and unwilling to work together to get things done for our Nation's citizens. I am dismayed that they continue to put partisan interests ahead of job creation, certainty for our businesses, and the democratic process.

Mr. Speaker, to preserve the principle of fairness for the minority and to ensure the democratic process continues as it has for centuries, I am, indeed, opposing this legislation as well as the Insurance Capital Standards Clarification Act that we will consider shortly.

I believe that if gone unchecked this type of legislating could increase and soon become commonplace. We must not circumvent our time-honored traditions for political gain.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN), the author and sponsor of title XI in this jobs bill.

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, today, I am proud to speak in support of H.R. 5405, and I do want to thank Representative FITZPATRICK from Pennsylvania for his important work on this bill. Among other things, this bill will help encourage capital formation at small and emerging businesses. These tools helps businesses expand their operation and, most importantly, hire more workers.

I am especially pleased that the bill includes my own legislation, the Encouraging Employee Ownership Act of 2014, or EEOA. This bipartisan provision would make it easier for companies in Illinois and nationwide to let hardworking employees own a stake in the business they are a part of.

I have learned firsthand from my constituents in the 14th Congressional

District about the many benefits of employee ownership. When you walk into Scot Forge, an entirely employee-owned manufacturer in my district, there is a noticeable difference in the energy of the employees, from upper management on down to the shop floor.

When employees have a stake in the company they work for, their sense of ownership over details large and small makes a real difference to their bottom line and, more importantly, to their quality of life.

The business, in turn, receives a large boost in productivity, enabling them to expand their reach and invest in new technologies and equipment.

Unfortunately, some companies are shying away from offering employee ownership because of regulations that limit how much ownership they can safely offer.

SEC rule 701 mandates various disclosures for privately-held companies that sell more than $5 million worth of securities for employee compensation. In 1999, the SEC arbitrarily set this threshold at $5 million without a concrete explanation why.

For businesses who want to offer more stock to more employees, this rule forces those businesses to make confidential disclosures that could greatly damage future innovations if they fell into the wrong hands.

The SEC's original rulemaking acknowledged this, and some voiced their concern that a disgruntled employee could use this confidential information to harm their former employer; further, it is costly to prepare these disclosures just so a business can offer the benefits of ownership to their employees. My bill, included in H.R. 5405, would address this problem.

As the Chamber of Commerce, who supports this legislation, has explained, this legislation would ''help give employees of American businesses a greater chance to participate in the success of their company.''

I want to thank Representatives BACHUS, FITZPATRICK, GARRETT, HURT, MULVANEY, ROSS, and STIVERS for their support.

It is also worth noting that, in good faith, both sides agree to lower the threshold to $10 million instead of the $20 million the bill originally included. I am glad we could iron out our differences and put forward a strong bill.

I want take thank my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, including Representative JARED POLIS of Colorado, for his support, and Representative JOHN DELANEY of Maryland, for his hard work on this bill.

The question remains: Do we want businesses to reserve employee ownership only for senior-level executives because of concerns about costs or the dissemination of confidential information?

Under my bill, they will not be forced to make that decision because of this easier and safer method of offering ownership to more employees.

I encourage all my colleagues to support this legislation.

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

Some Members will come to the floor, and they will support this legislation because they may have one bill in this package, and I understand that. Some Members may have cosponsored a bill or worked on one bill. These Members, no matter how well-intended they are, cannot speak to the other 10 bills in the package because they don't know what those other 10 bills are all about.

Many don't have a clue about these other bills. Members will not even remember how they voted for or against bills that have been placed in this package.

What is being asked of the Members of this House is to forget about what really works for all Members. What they are asking Members to do at the last minute, before we close down this session, is to vote for a bill where they have packaged this large number of bills without understanding what they are or what is in them.

Just vote for them because we want a political package that says, ''We are doing something about jobs. We are going to present this as a jobs package. We are going to do more than anybody else for jobs.''

This is unreasonable. It is actually unconscionable. They should not put this burden on the Members.

I am going to ask Members to vote ''no'' on this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. HURT), vice chairman of the Capital Markets Subcommittee of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. HURT. I thank Mr. FITZPATRICK and the chairman of the Financial Services Committee for their leadership on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, for the record, all 11 bills in this package have been either voted on in full committee or on this floor with bipartisan support; so the idea that these have never been heard before and that no one knows what is in them is not accurate.

I rise in support of this good bill, the Promoting Job Creation and Reducing Small Business Burdens Act. With millions of Americans still out of work, our top focus must be enacting policies that help spur job growth throughout our country.

Unfortunately, I continue to hear from my constituents in Virginia's Fifth District about the impact of costly regulations on job creation, especially those regulations that disproportionately affect smaller public companies that wish to access capital in our public markets.

One such regulation is related to the use of eXtensible Business Reporting Language, or XBRL, which was mandated by the Securities and Exchange Commission in 2009. While the SEC's rule is well-intended, this regulation has become another example of a requirement where the costs outweigh the potential benefits.

These small companies spend tens of thousands of dollars or more complying with the regulation, yet there is substantial evidence that fewer than 10 percent of investors actually use XBRL, further diminishing its potential benefits.

That is why Representative TERRI SEWELL and I crafted the bipartisan Small Company Disclosure Simplification Act which is incorporated into title VII of the bill we are considering today.

This provision will provide an optional exemption for emerging growth companies and smaller public companies from the requirement to file their information in XBRL with the SEC, the same information which is already filed with the SEC in a readily accessible format; additionally, this bill requires the SEC to perform a cost-benefit analysis on the rule's impact on smaller public companies, something the SEC failed to adequately address in the original rule.

Whether a supporter or a skeptic of XBRL, these provisions will help provide a pathway for the SEC to focus on developing a system of disclosure for smaller companies that eliminate unnecessary costs while achieving greater benefits.

I ask my colleagues to join me today in voting on this good bill so that we can continue to promote capital access in our public markets and spur job growth for working Americans across our country.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON).

Mr. ELLISON. I thank the gentlewoman.

Mr. Speaker, no Member of Congress is ever going to come down to the floor and tell you, ''This bill that I'm offering is going to cut jobs, empower the most powerful, and weaken people who are already in precarious economic circumstances.''

Nobody is going to come and offer you the anti-jobs bill. It is not just going to happen. Every Member who comes down here is going to proclaim, ''Jobs, jobs, jobs and, if you do this right now, jobs''—chicken in every pot kind of talk—but we have a certain way that we do things here, and that is what the suspension calendar is for, noncontroversial legislation.

It is for things that nobody has a real point of opposing. It is not where you bring forth a bill of complicated derivatives legislation and where Members should offer and debate amendments, and there should be an open rule.

This bill actually combines a whole range of very complicated financial information. This is the kind of bill that people decry and why they are angry with Washington, D.C., when they hear that they are passing all types of bills that have sweeping implications for Americans all over this country and people don't even know about it.

The fact is that there are at least 15 separate pieces of legislation contained in what is being offered as, essentially, a noncontroversial bill. This bill is anything but noncontroversial.

I want to hasten to add, Mr. Speaker, that there might be pieces of legislation contained in this megabill that they are offering that have merit. I am not even saying that it is 100 percent bad. I am simply saying that it is highly controversial and it is extremely complicated.

I happen to remember being on the floor when we debated the Affordable Care Act. My colleagues on the other side made a huge point of saying, ''There are 2,000 pages, and there's five stacks.'' They made this case that there was this big, giant, voluminous bill and people didn't know what was in it and they were going to be called upon to pass this huge bill the public wouldn't really understand. They raised a policy point.

My point to them right now is that if passing a bill that is voluminous and that people don't understand is not a good thing, then don't do it. You can hardly put yourself in the position of doing exactly what you accuse your opponents of doing.

We should be taking these bills one by one and having amendments and debating them. I can tell you there are a number of bills in here that I personally am concerned about.

The Inter-Affiliate Swap Clarification Act is a bill that I believe would diminish the protections to the public of derivatives trading. The Customer Protection End User Relief Act may not have merit, but it is a complicated piece of legislation, and anyone who wants to tune in and watch the debate so they can understand what their Congress is doing ought to be able to do so. We shouldn't just package it up and sweep it through on some big vote.

I am urging a very strong ''no'' vote because the process is all wrong. If these bills have merit, let them stand on their own two feet. Please don't run this thing down our throat in the late evening hours or even in the morning.

Let's deal with these bills in a careful way that this country deserves. Let's say to the American people that this complicated financial legislation deserves debate, rebuttal, and amendment, and we need an open rule to do this thing right. There is no need to rush this thing through.

I just want to end the way that I started, Mr. Speaker. Everybody declares they are for jobs. Everybody says, ''Do what I am asking you to do for jobs.'' That will be the case whether it is some sort of big, giant loophole for a huge oil company who is just going to pocket the money, and it is going to be the case if somebody wants to get rid of health and safety regulations. It is going to be the case in nearly any case that we want to talk about here.

□ 2000

But good legislation stands scrutiny, withstands debate, and certainly wouldn't be afraid of standing on its own, which is exactly what this piece of legislation does not offer.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a very strong ''no'' vote for this complicated bill that involves very, very serious financial legislation that really needs to be handled one bill at a time.

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

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

You have heard from me and Congressman ELLISON why this process is a process that we cannot in any way allow to take place without the kind of criticism that we are putting forth about this. This rises to the point of being shameful. This rises to the point of being disrespectful. This rises to the point of placing all of our colleagues in a position where, if anybody asked them about what is in this bill, if any of their constituents wanted to know what they voted on, they would not be able to tell them so.

They would not be able to tell them so because most of the Members, for the most part, that are going to come to this floor and vote on this bill just simply have not had the time, even if they had the background, to look into this bill. They have not had the time to ask others in their caucus about this bill. They have not had time to ask any of the advocacy organizations about this bill, for or against.

Now I understand again, and I want to repeat this, why some Members feel it absolutely necessary even though they don't like it. They have got one bill in here that they have worked on, that they have put a lot of time in and that they believe in, and they want desperately to have their bill passed.

So they are going to swallow what is being done to them in order to get, perhaps, an opportunity to get their bill, but they don't like it. And they will tell you, not on this floor, but behind the scenes, that they don't like it. They don't like the way they are being treated.

As a matter of fact, if we had the time for a real debate on this floor tonight and we asked any of the Members on the opposite side of the aisle to go down and debate these 11 bills that are in this first package, you wouldn't find two or three that would be able to do it. And the same thing on the second bill that is going to come up that talks about some issues in the insurance industry.

This should not happen. And the fact that the suspensions process has been hijacked is something that this floor and this Congress is going to have to deal with for the future. This should not happen.

We know why it was intended, why suspensions are necessary to expedite or when you have noncontroversial bills, but it was not intended for this kind of hijacking. It was not intended where you could take a whole bundle of bills, throw them into one, behind one bill that was hastily put together, that is going to do a lot of damage, and somehow call it a legitimate suspension bill.

So, Mr. Speaker and Members, let this be a lesson to all of us that we are going to have to pay attention to the rules of suspension; and if there needs to be a modification or change that will not allow this kind of thing to happen, some of us are going to have to take up leadership in doing that modification, coming forth with some new kind of ruling that will not allow this to happen.

And more than anything else, if my friends on the opposite side of the aisle get away with this, we can just throw our hands up because what they will do for the future is save all the difficult bills, add to it a bill, and then package them all and put Members in the kind of position that they are trying to put them in tonight.

It is unfair. It should not happen, and I am going to ask for a ''no'' vote on this bill.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to address an objection raised by my friend from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON). He called this bill that is before us, H.R. 5405, a megabill.

I would like to note for the RECORD that the bill is 39 pages, as opposed to Dodd-Frank, which accumulated about 2,300 pages. This is a 39-page bill, and it is written in plain English; everybody understands it, composed of 11 bills, 11 sub-bills, subtitles. Each one of those bills had its own hearing in the Financial Services Committee, and those hearings had witnesses and those bills had markup hearings. At those markup hearings, there was opportunity for amendment and debate.

So what I am saying, Mr. Speaker, is each one of these 11 bills make up a 39-page bill, divided approximately four pages per bill, written in plain English everybody understands, all debated quite a bit already in this session. Those bills, when they were sponsored, they were bipartisan in sponsorship. They passed the House in bipartisan fashion. And before that, they were before the committee with their bipartisan cosponsors and passed the committee in bipartisan fashion.

So this is not a megabill, Mr. Speaker. This is actually just the opposite. This is a plain-English bill of bipartisan fashion that has already been debated and vetted fully in the committee and in this House.

So to take the idea that you could put 11 bills that are bipartisan and passed overwhelmingly together and it is going to produce results and, yes, Mr. ELLISON, jobs for the American people, unleash the power of the American economy to put people back to work, I am not sure how that becomes a bad thing. I think that is a very good thing, because my friends on the other

side of the aisle are talking about process and procedure and debate and amendments. We are talking about results.

Now Ms. WATERS of California, the ranking member, has raised two objections. First she called this a partisan effort. Eleven bipartisan bills, hardly partisan, all passed the House or committee with bipartisan support.

The second thing that Ms. WATERS has identified is an objection to this. She calls this a mad dash for political gain. Mr. Speaker, this is a mad dash for sensible regulation for small businesses in Bucks County, in Pennsylvania, and across our Nation. This is a mad dash to get the Senate to do something, to do anything, to help American job creators. Mr. Speaker, this is a mad dash to get results.

As I said, there is a lot of talk on this floor and in this town about ending the partisan divide, about getting people to work together. These are bipartisan bills that produce results, that get things done. This is a good bill.

Of the 11 bills that make it up, 10 of them were supported by Ms. WATERS and voted for by Ms. WATERS. The 11th bill, that she objected to, her witness in the hearing identified some issues with that 11th bill, and we actually negotiated against ourselves. We made changes to the 11th bill to make it more palatable so that everybody could come together around a job-creation bill. That is the bill that is before the House. That is the one that we are asking the Members to support.

So in closing, Mr. Speaker, a vote for this legislation is a vote to support emerging growth companies. It is a vote for small businesses. It is a vote for entrepreneurs. It is a vote for the American worker.

These are the people we are counting on to drive American progress and economic progress, to fuel the next American century. I urge my colleagues to support this measure and pass these bills.

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 Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5405, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. ELLISON. 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 motion will be postponed.

AMERICAN SAVINGS PROMOTION ACT

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3374) to provide for the use of savings promotion raffle products by financial institutions to encourage savings, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3374

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 ''American Savings Promotion Act''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) the annual savings rate in the United States was 4.1 percent in 2012;

(2) more than 40 percent of American households lack the savings to cover basic expenses for 3 months, if an unexpected event leads to a loss of stable income;

(3) personal savings provide Americans with the financial resources to meet future needs, including higher education and homeownership, while also providing a safety net to weather unexpected financial shocks;

(4) prize-linked savings products are typical savings products offered by financial institutions, like savings accounts, certificates of deposit, and savings bonds, with the added feature of offering chances to win prizes based on deposit activity;

(5) the State of Michigan was the first State to allow credit unions to offer prize-linked savings products, and in 2009 launched the first large-scale prize-linked savings product in the United States;

(6) the States of Connecticut, Michigan, Maine, Maryland, Nebraska, North Carolina, Rhode Island, and Washington all have laws that allow financial institutions to offer prize-linked savings products;

(7) in the States of Michigan and Nebraska, more than 42,000 individuals have opened prize-linked savings accounts and saved more than $72,000,000;

(8) prize-linked savings products have been shown to successfully attract non-savers, the asset poor, and low-to-moderate income groups, providing individuals with a new tool to build personal savings; and

(9) encouraging personal savings is in the national interest of the United States.

SEC. 3. AMENDMENT TO DEFINITIONS OF "LOTTERY".

(a) NATIONAL BANKS.—Section 5136B(c) of the Revised Statutes of the United States (12 U.S.C. 25a(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by inserting '', other than a savings promotion raffle,'' before ''whereby''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(4) The term 'savings promotion raffle' means a contest in which the sole consideration required for a chance of winning designated prizes is obtained by the deposit of a specified amount of money in a savings account or other savings program, where each ticket or entry has an equal chance of being drawn, such contest being subject to regulations that may from time to time be promulgated by the appropriate prudential regulator (as defined in section 1002 of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5481)).''.

(b) FEDERAL RESERVE BANKS.—Section 9A(c) of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 339(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by inserting '', other than a savings promotion raffle,'' before ''whereby''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(4) The term 'savings promotion raffle' means a contest in which the sole consideration required for a chance of winning designated prizes is obtained by the deposit of a specified amount of money in a savings account or other savings program, where each ticket or entry has an equal chance of being drawn, such contest being subject to regulations that may from time to time be promulgated by the appropriate prudential regulator (as defined in section 1002 of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5481)).''.

(c) INSURED DEPOSITORY INSTITUTIONS.—Section 20(c) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1829a(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by inserting '', other than a savings promotion raffle,'' before ''whereby''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(4) The term 'savings promotion raffle' means a contest in which the sole consideration required for a chance of winning designated prizes is obtained by the deposit of a specified amount of money in a savings account or other savings program, where each ticket or entry has an equal chance of being drawn, such contest being subject to regulations that may from time to time be promulgated by the appropriate prudential regulator (as defined in section 1002 of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5481)).''.

(d) FEDERAL SAVINGS AND LOAN ASSOCIATIONS.—Section 4(e)(3) of the Home Owners' Loan Act (12 U.S.C. 1463(e)(3)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (B), by inserting '', other than a savings promotion raffle,'' after ''arrangement''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(D) SAVINGS PROMOTION RAFFLE.—The term 'savings promotion raffle' means a contest in which the sole consideration required for a chance of winning designated prizes is obtained by the deposit of a specified amount of money in a savings account or other savings program, where each ticket or entry has an equal chance of being drawn, such contest being subject to regulations that may from time to time be promulgated by the appropriate prudential regulator (as defined in section 1002 of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5481)).''.

SEC. 4. CRIMINAL PROVISIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 61 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''§ 1308. Limitation of applicability

''(a) LIMITATION OF APPLICABILITY.—Sections 1301, 1302, 1303, 1304, and 1306 shall not apply—

''(1) to a savings promotion raffle conducted by an insured depository institution or an insured credit union; or

''(2) to any activity conducted in connection with any such savings promotion raffle, including, without limitation, to the—

''(A) transmission of any advertisement, list of prizes, or other information concerning the savings promotion raffle;

''(B) offering, facilitation, and acceptance of deposits, withdrawals, or other transactions in connection with the savings promotion raffle;

''(C) transmission of any information relating to the savings promotion raffle, including account balance and transaction information; and

''(D) deposit or transmission of prizes awarded in the savings promotion raffle as well as notification or publication thereof.

''(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

''(1) the term 'insured credit union' shall have the meaning given the term in section 101 of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1752);

''(2) the term 'insured depository institution' shall have the meaning given the term in section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1813); and

''(3) the term 'savings promotion raffle' means a contest in which the sole consideration required for a chance of winning designated prizes is obtained by the deposit of a specified amount of money in a savings account or other savings program, where each ticket or entry has an equal chance of being drawn, such contest being subject to regulations that may from time to time be promulgated by the appropriate prudential regulator (as defined in section 1002 of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5481)).''.

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 61 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding after the item relating to section 1307 the following:

''1308. Limitation of applicability.''.

SEC. 5. RACKETEERING.

Chapter 95 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in section 1952, by adding at the end the following:

''(e)(1) This section shall not apply to a savings promotion raffle conducted by an insured depository institution or an insured credit union.

''(2) In this subsection—

''(A) the term 'insured credit union' shall have the meaning given the term in section 101 of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1752);

''(B) the term 'insured depository institution' shall have the meaning given the term in section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1813); and

''(C) the term 'savings promotion raffle' means a contest in which the sole consideration required for a chance of winning designated prizes is obtained by the deposit of a specified amount of money in a savings account or other savings program, where each ticket or entry has an equal chance of being drawn, such contest being subject to regulations that may from time to time be promulgated by the appropriate prudential regulator (as defined in section 1002 of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5481)).'';

(2) in section 1953—

(A) in subsection (b), by striking ''or (5)'' and inserting ''(5) equipment, tickets, or materials used or designed for use in a savings promotion raffle operated by an insured depository institution or an insured credit union, or (6)''; and

(B) by striking subsections (d) and (e) and inserting the following:

''(d) For purposes of this section—

''(1) the term 'foreign country' means any empire, country, dominion, colony, or protectorate, or any subdivision thereof (other than the United States, its territories or possessions);

''(2) the term 'insured credit union' shall have the meaning given the term in section 101 of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1752);

''(3) the term 'insured depository institution' shall have the meaning given the term in section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1813);

''(4) the term 'lottery'—

''(A) means the pooling of proceeds derived from the sale of tickets or chances and allotting those proceeds or parts thereof by chance to one or more chance takers or ticket purchasers; and

''(B) does not include the placing or accepting of bets or wagers on sporting events or contests;

''(5) the term 'savings promotion raffle' means a contest in which the sole consideration required for a chance of winning designated prizes is obtained by the deposit of a specified amount of money in a savings account or other savings program, where each ticket or entry has an equal chance of being drawn, such contest being subject to regulations that may from time to time be promulgated by the appropriate prudential regulator (as defined in section 1002 of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5481)); and

''(6) the term 'State' means a State of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, or any territory or possession of the United States.''; and

(3) in section 1955—

(A) in subsection (b)—

(i) by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (4);

(ii) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (6);

(iii) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

''(2) 'insured credit union' shall have the meaning given the term in section 101 of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1752).

''(3) 'insured depository institution' shall have the meaning given the term in section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1813).''; and

(iv) by inserting after paragraph (4), as redesignated, the following:

''(5) 'savings promotion raffle' means a contest in which the sole consideration required for a chance of winning designated prizes is obtained by the deposit of a specified amount of money in a savings account or other savings program, where each ticket or entry has an equal chance of being drawn, such contest being subject to regulations that may from time to time be promulgated by the appropriate prudential regulator (as defined in section 1002 of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5481)).''; and

(B) in subsection (e)—

(i) by striking ''shall not apply to any bingo'' and inserting the following: ''shall not apply to—

''(1) any bingo'';

(ii) by striking the period and inserting ''; or''; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) any savings promotion raffle.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BENTIVOLIO). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and submit extraneous materials for the RECORD on H.R. 3374, as amended, and currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Mr. KILMER, Mr. COTTON, and Ms. TSONGAS for their efforts in drafting the legislation that is before us this evening.

The American Savings Promotion Act is bipartisan legislation that would remove Federal barriers and allow financial institutions to offer savings promotion raffles.

Studies show that Americans are not saving enough, whether for an emergency or for their retirement. This lack of savings is more pronounced among those with lower incomes. H.R. 3374 seeks to reverse this trend and encourage savings by offering depositors chances to win prizes based on their deposit activity.

This legislation would simply amend Federal law to allow depositors to enter into a lottery in lieu of accruing interest, with the number of raffle tickets based on the size of their deposit.

The American Savings Promotion Act is a commonsense bill that will provide consumers greater access to the financial services they want and need. Allowing financial institutions the ability to provide innovative products is a simple way to encourage consumers to open savings accounts, incentivize saving, and foster healthier financial habits.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of this bipartisan legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3374, the American Savings Promotion Act, which has been offered by my colleague from Washington (Mr. KILMER). This bill is an example of the innovation Democrats bring to addressing the concerns of the chronically unbanked.

Building on the success of credit unions offering such programs, this bill enables banks to offer similar products, vastly increasing the reach of this creative savings product.

Prize-linked savings accounts encourage customers to set aside savings by combining the more mundane task of setting aside money with the excitement of playing the lottery. Customers are always eligible to withdraw the principal of their savings account but forego accrued interest for the chance of winning all of the interest of participants in the program.

Such programs have been offered in South Africa, resulting in more than $200 million being set aside in savings accounts by more than 750,000 individuals who had largely not set up a bank account. In Washington State, credit unions that offer such accounts have found that these accounts are helping to build an ethic of frugality.

Today, credit unions are permitted to offer such programs if State law permits them, which includes four States: Washington, Michigan, Nebraska, and North Carolina. However, even though these States permit prize-linked savings accounts, Federal banking laws prevent banks from offering them because of a decades-old prohibition on participation in a lottery.

□ 2015

Mr. KILMER's bill retains the general prohibition against lotteries but permits banks to offer prize-linked savings if the bank's State also allows them.

It is not a secret that this country does not save enough, that we are not preparing for the unexpected or even for how we will afford college tuition expenses or retirement. We also know that, once someone begins to pile on debt, it can be nearly impossible to dig out. Mr. KILMER's bill enables our constituents to say ''no'' to debt by encouraging good savings habits.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. KILMER), the author of the bill.

Mr. KILMER. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

I would also like to thank Chair CAPITO and Ranking Member MEEKS, as well as Chairman HENSARLING and Ranking Member WATERS, for their efforts to move the American Savings Promotion Act to the floor of the House today.

Mr. Speaker, my legislation would remove Federal barriers that today prevent some financial institutions from being able to offer innovative financial products, known as prize-linked savings accounts. These safe, regulated financial products are designed to make savings fun. The more you save, the more chances you have to win. As a Dire Straits fan, I called this idea the ''Money for Nothing'' concept. If you make deposits, you get more chances to win, and even if you don't win, you get to keep the money you saved.

Many families understand the importance of saving money to help them manage expected costs like college or retirement and unexpected costs that they might face, whether it is a trip to the emergency room or repairing their cars, but we know too many Americans struggle to set aside a little bit of cash every month. Nearly a quarter of Americans report they wouldn't be able to come up with at least $2,000 in 30 days. Another 19 percent said they could, but they would have to begin pawning or selling their possessions or taking out payday loans.

The idea behind prize-linked savings accounts is based on the recognition that people are significantly motivated by rewards, and when it comes to saving money, the idea of earning pennies on the dollar just isn't all that attractive to a lot of folks, particularly those who don't have a lot to save in the first place. Prize-linked savings accounts seek to step into that gap and provide savers with a product that keeps folks excited about saving by offering cash prizes.

The research shows that prize-linked savings accounts are actually working to boost savings. The National Bureau of Economic Research recently published an analysis of these accounts, finding that the data ''demonstrate clearly'' that individuals save at a higher rate when they are offered the use of prize-linked savings accounts. Unfortunately, under Federal law, only some financial institutions are able to offer these products.

My legislation, which I am proud to have worked on with Representative TOM COTTON, alongside Senators JERRY MORAN and SHERROD BROWN, would clear away the Federal obstacles so that more financial institutions can offer these products. It accomplishes this without establishing a new government program, without spending scarce Federal dollars, and without preempting State laws.

Over the past 4 years, an estimated 50,000 account holders have saved more than $94 million using prize-linked savings accounts. Even if those members don't win a big cash prize, they are strengthening their financial cushions to withstand whatever life throws at them while developing a habit of saving.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the American Savings Promotion Act.

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

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to thank Representative COTTON of Arkansas for his leadership on this bill and for the leadership of his cosponsors. I urge my colleagues to pass the bill as submitted.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following correspondence between the Financial Services Committee and the Judiciary Committee on H.R. 3374, as amended.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, DC, September 12, 2014.

Hon. JEB HENSARLING,
Chairman, Committee on Financial Services, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN HENSARLING, I am writing concerning H.R. 3374, the ''American Savings Promotion Act,'' which was referred primarily to your Committee, and additionally to the Committee on the Judiciary.

As a result of your having consulted with the Judiciary Committee on the provisions in our jurisdiction and in order to expedite the House's consideration of H.R. 3374, 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. 3374 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 the 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 your response to this letter confirming this understanding, and would request that you include a copy of this letter and your response in the Congressional Record during the floor consideration of this bill.

Sincerely,

BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES,
Washington, DC, September 12, 2014.

Hon. BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN GOODLATTE: Thank you for your letter of even date herewith regarding H.R. 3374, the American Savings Promotion Act.

I am most appreciative of your decision to forego consideration of H.R. 3374 so that it may move expeditiously to the House floor. I acknowledge that although you are waiving formal consideration of the bill, the Committee on the Judiciary is in no way waiving its jurisdiction over any subject matter contained in the bill that falls within its jurisdiction.

In addition, if a conference is necessary on this legislation, I will support any request that your committee be represented therein.

Finally, I shall be pleased to include your letter and this letter in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of H.R. 3374.

Sincerely,

JEB HENSARLING,
Chairman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3374, 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.

BOYS TOWN CENTENNIAL COMMEMORATIVE COIN ACT

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2866) to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the centennial of Boys Town, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2866

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 ''Boys Town Centennial Commemorative Coin Act''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) Boys Town is a nonprofit organization dedicated to saving children and healing families, nationally headquartered in the village of Boys Town, Nebraska;

(2) Father Flanagan's Boys Home, known as ''Boys Town'', was founded on December 12, 1917, by Servant of God Father Edward Flanagan;

(3) Boys Town was created to serve children of all races and religions;

(4) news of the work of Father Flanagan spread worldwide with the success of the 1938 movie, ''Boys Town'';

(5) after World War II, President Truman asked Father Flanagan to take his message to the world, and Father Flanagan traveled the globe visiting war orphans and advising government leaders on how to care for displaced children;

(6) Boys Town has grown exponentially, and now provides care to children and families across the country in 11 regions, including California, Nevada, Texas, Nebraska,

Iowa, Louisiana, North Florida, Central Florida, South Florida, Washington, DC, New York, and New England;

(7) the Boys Town National Hotline provides counseling to more than 150,000 callers each year;

(8) the Boys Town National Research Hospital is a national leader in the field of hearing care and research of Usher Syndrome;

(9) Boys Town programs impact the lives of more than 2,000,000 children and families across America each year; and

(10) December 12th, 2017, will mark the 100th anniversary of Boys Town, Nebraska.

SEC. 3. COIN SPECIFICATIONS.

(a) $5 GOLD COINS.—The Secretary of the Treasury (referred to in this Act as the ''Secretary'') shall mint and issue not more than 50,000 $5 coins in commemoration of the centennial of the founding of Father Flanagan's Boys Town, each of which shall—

(1) weigh 8.359 grams;

(2) have a diameter of 0.850 inches; and

(3) contain 90 percent gold and 10 percent alloy.

(b) $1 SILVER COINS.—The Secretary shall mint and issue not more than 350,000 $1 coins in commemoration of the centennial of the founding of Father Flanagan's Boys Town, each of which shall—

(1) weigh 26.73 grams;

(2) have a diameter of 1.500 inches; and

(3) contain 90 percent silver and 10 percent copper.

(c) HALF DOLLAR CLAD COINS.—The Secretary shall mint and issue not more than 300,000 half dollar clad coins in commemoration of the centennial of the founding of Father Flanagan's Boys Town, each of which shall—

(1) weigh 11.34 grams;

(2) have a diameter of 1.205 inches; and

(3) be minted to the specifications for half dollar coins contained in section 5112(b) of title 31, United States Code.

(d) LEGAL TENDER.—The coins minted under this Act shall be legal tender, as provided in section 5103 of title 31, United States Code.

(e) NUMISMATIC ITEMS.—For purposes of sections 5134 and 5136 of title 31, United States Code, all coins minted under this Act shall be considered to be numismatic items.

SEC. 4. DESIGN OF COINS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The design of the coins minted under this Act shall be emblematic of the 100 years of Boys Town, one of the largest nonprofit child care agencies in the United States.

(b) DESIGNATION AND INSCRIPTIONS.—On each coin minted under this Act, there shall be—

(1) a designation of the value of the coin;

(2) an inscription of the year ''2017''; and

(3) inscriptions of the words ''Liberty'', ''In God We Trust'', ''United States of America'', and ''E Pluribus Unum''.

(c) SELECTION.—The design for the coins minted under this Act shall be—

(1) selected by the Secretary, after consultation with the National Executive Director of Boys Town and the Commission of Fine Arts; and

(2) reviewed by the Citizens of Coinage Advisory Committee.

SEC. 5. ISSUANCE OF COINS.

(a) QUALITY OF COINS.—Coins minted under this Act shall be issued in uncirculated and proof qualities.

(b) MINT FACILITY.—Only 1 facility of the United States Mint may be used to strike any particular quality of the coins minted under this Act.

(c) PERIOD FOR ISSUANCE.—The Secretary may issue coins under this Act only during the period beginning on January 1, 2017, and ending on December 31, 2017.

SEC. 6. SALE OF COINS.

(a) SALE PRICE.—The coins issued under this Act shall be sold by the Secretary at a price equal to the sum of—

(1) the face value of the coins; and

(2) the cost of designing and issuing the coins (including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, overhead expenses, marketing, and shipping).

(b) BULK SALES.—The Secretary shall make bulk sales of the coins issued under this Act at a reasonable discount.

(c) PREPAID ORDERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall accept prepaid orders for the coins minted under this Act before the issuance of such coins.

(2) DISCOUNT.—Sale prices with respect to prepaid orders under paragraph (1) shall be at a reasonable discount.

SEC. 7. SURCHARGES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—All sales of coins issued under this Act shall include a surcharge as follows:

(1) A surcharge of $35 per coin for the $5 coin.

(2) A surcharge of $10 per coin for the $1 coin.

(3) A surcharge of $5 per coin for the half dollar coin.

(b) DISTRIBUTION.—Subject to section 5134(f) of title 31, United States Code, all surcharges received by the Secretary from the sale of coins issued under this Act shall be paid to Boys Town to carry out Boys Town's cause of caring for and assisting children and families in underserved communities across America.

SEC. 8. FINANCIAL ASSURANCES.

The Secretary shall take such actions as may be necessary to ensure that—

(1) minting and issuing coins under this Act will not result in any net cost to the Federal Government; and

(2) no funds, including applicable surcharges , shall be disbursed to any recipient designated in section 7 until the total cost of designing and issuing all of the coins authorized by this Act (including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, overhead expenses, marketing, and shipping) is recovered by the United States Treasury, consistent with sections 5112(m) and 5134(f) of title 31, United States Code.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to submit extraneous materials for the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

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

I rise today in support of H.R. 2866, the Boys Town Centennial Commemorative Coin Act, introduced by the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. TERRY), and seek its immediate passage.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation before us commemorates the centennial, in 2017, of the founding of Boys Town, an almost mythic place that pioneered a method of caring for the youth of this country who had fallen by the wayside in one way or another. In a way, the coin commemorates the spirit of what was then still a young country and of Boys Town's founder, Father Edward Flanagan.

Irish-born, he had come to this country only a bit more than 100 years after the first Congress met, yet, by the time he had died, he had been sent by President Truman to all corners of the globe to teach others to care for kids as he had done. Ordained in 1912, Father Flanagan was assigned to the Diocese of Omaha and, after a stint of working with homeless men, decided to focus on youths, founding what later came to be called ''The City of Little Men.'' He famously thought, as the Boys Town Web site points out, that every child could be a productive citizen if given love, a home, an education, and a trade. He accepted boys of every race, color, and religion, and he believed that there are no bad boys, there is only bad environment, bad training, bad example, bad thinking.

I am almost certain that every Member of this Chamber knows that famous line that became the motto of Boys Town: ''He ain't heavy, Mister. He's my brother.'' That is what is said by an older lad, with a younger boy on his shoulders, in a logo adopted during the Second World War. All of us, surely, know the ''Boys Town'' movie, with Mickey Rooney, that won Spencer Tracy an Oscar for the role of Boys Town founder, Father Flanagan, but how many of us know that the organization that began in a rented, rundown Victorian mansion in central Omaha as Father Flanagan's Home for Boys has grown to be one of the country's largest nonprofit child care organizations, serving the emotional, behavioral, and physical problems of children and their families—as many as 2 million people each year? Or that it operates throughout the country, in 12 major sites, from California to south Florida to New England, and even here in the District of Columbia?

Boys Town maintains its national headquarters in the Nebraska village of the same name, on the site of a farm Father Flanagan bought a few years after renting that first house for $90. There he founded a community that, under the careful hands of those leaders following his death, expanded its services to help kids live in a family setting, with married couples carefully watching the units that included both boys and girls. In the 1970s, the Boys Town National Research Hospital opened. It has become a top treatment center for kids with speech and hearing disabilities, with outreach programs that touch as many as 60,000 deaf and hearing-impaired students each year.

The bill before us would allow the minting and issue in 2017 of no more than 50,000 gold coins and no more than 350,000 silver coins in commemoration of the centennial of the founding of

Boys Town. The coins would be sold at a price that covers all taxpayer costs, and a surcharge on the sale of the coins would go to Boys Town to continue its work after Boys Town has raised an equal amount from private sources. The legislation has 293 cosponsors, and a Senate companion bill, introduced by Senator JOHANNS, has 36 cosponsors.

Mr. Speaker, the spirit of Boys Town embodies the best of America. This bill would help recognize and continue to nurture that spirit. I commend the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. TERRY) for his hard work on this issue. I ask for the immediate passage of the bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I rise today in support of H.R. 2866, as amended, a bill which provides appropriate recognition for the outstanding work conducted by Boys Town, a nonprofit organization which selflessly promotes the interests of children and their families across the Nation.

Boys Town, which takes its name from Father Flanagan's Boys' Home, impacts the lives of more than 2 million families across America each year through its counseling services, outreach, and education. I am also pleased to report that, each year, Boys Town directly touches the lives of 45,000 Californians through its community support services and homes for troubled youths.

Father Flanagan, the founder of Boys Town, focused on the inherent good in children and built a world-class organization that emphasized the rehabilitation of troubled youths rather than punishment. It is this compassionate approach and commitment to love, training, and guidance, regardless of race, creed, or color, that has made Boys Town such a success story and a lifeline for countless children and their families.

In commemoration of the organization's centennial anniversary, the bill before us today will require the U.S. Treasury Department to mint and issue $5 gold, $1 silver, and half-dollar clad commemorative coins. Surcharges associated with the sale of the coins will allow Boys Town to raise needed funds that will be dedicated to making a positive impact on the lives of children and families from underserved communities across America. I am also pleased to report that the passage of this bill entails no net cost to taxpayers.

I would urge my colleagues to join me in passing this commonsense, bipartisan bill without further delay.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. TERRY), the sponsor of this legislation.

Mr. TERRY. Thank you. I appreciate the support.

I also thank the gentlewoman from California for her support all the way from the beginning of this bill to today's passage. It means a lot to me and to the people of Omaha and Boys Town.

This bill will honor the significant contributions, Mr. Speaker, of Boys Town and how, in my district, it has impacted our community and our country with a fitting tribute to the legacy of Father Flanagan, who founded Boys Town.

A priest and an immigrant from Ireland, Father Flanagan was of modest means, but in 1917—about 5 years after becoming a priest—he borrowed $90 from B'nai B'rith member Henry Monsky to open a boarding house because they both shared a love for the homeless boys, who had been abandoned or orphaned, living on the streets of our city. They created this boarding house, went out and recruited boys from the streets to come in, where he not only housed them and fed them but where he educated them and taught them a trade. He really felt that the education and the trade were necessary parts of making them into men who would be part of the community and be successful. Father Flanagan did not differentiate between race or religion, and by the spring of the next year, 100 boys found refuge in Father Flanagan's home. It is great seeing the pictures from that era of boys of all races who were eating together and playing together.

In 1921, Father Flanagan opened his doors further. He was able to purchase the Overlook Farm way on the outskirts. Now I have to drive about 50 blocks east to get to it, as it is surrounded by Omaha. That is the property that is now known, iconically, as ''Boys Town.''

□ 2030

It became an official village with its own post office in 1936.

Today, Boys Town serves more than 2 million children and families across our country each year. It provides parental counseling. The Boys Town national hotline provides counseling to more than 150,000 children and families each year.

The Boys Town National Research Hospital is a national leader in the field of hearing care and research of Usher syndrome, and all of this is thanks to the vision of Father Flanagan when he borrowed $90 to start a boys' home.

Now, also I should mention that it was probably around the seventies—I can't remember the date—when women—young girls were allowed in there. In fact, a couple of times, I have had the pleasure of being invited to dinner at one of the houses there where they have a host family, and there were eight girls in this house who were then ordered by the court or placed there by a family to help them with a variety of issues, mostly disciplinary, some health care.

In fact, Boys Town is now becoming the leader in research for pharmaceuticals for young children, for children, teenagers. Most of them have come to Boys Town with about four or five different prescriptions, and Boys Town, because of their way of counseling and dealing with it, can get most of them off of the prescription drugs.

This is what Boys Town stands for. As Father Flanagan once said, ''I know, when the idea of a boys' home grew in my mind, I never thought of anything remarkable about taking in all of the races and all of the creeds. To me, they are all God's children. They are my brothers. They are children of God. I must protect them to the best of my ability.''

Mr. Speaker, 97 years later, inspired by Father Flanagan, here we are, and that vision stands as true today as it did in 1917.

It is the inscription of the iconic statue of the two boys, one on the shoulder of the other, that stood as the centerpiece of the village for more than 70 years now. ''He ain't heavy. He's my brother.'' That is the Boys Town way, to be full of compassion and to help our fellow man.

I encourage all of my colleagues to support this legislation.

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

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, in closing, I just want to, again, thank Mr. TERRY of Nebraska for his hard work on this issue and so many other issues.

The passage of this bill is an appropriate way to commemorate the great work and the legacy of Father Flanagan, of his home for boys, of the medical center that bears that name, and the great work of the boys and girls who come through the facilities of Boys Town throughout the country; so I urge my colleagues to support the bill and pass it under suspension.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2866, 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.

INSURANCE CAPITAL STANDARDS CLARIFICATION ACT OF 2014

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5461) to clarify the application of certain leverage and risk-based requirements under the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, to improve upon the definitions provided for points and fees in connection with a mortgage transaction, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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. TABLE OF CONTENTS.

The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

TITLE I—INSURANCE CAPITAL STANDARDS

SEC. 101. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Insurance Capital Standards Clarification Act of 2014''.

SEC. 102. CLARIFICATION OF APPLICATION OF LEVERAGE AND RISK-BASED CAPITAL REQUIREMENTS.

Section 171 of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (12 U.S.C. 5371) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by adding at the end the following:

''(4) BUSINESS OF INSURANCE.—The term 'business of insurance' has the same meaning as in section 1002(3).

''(5) PERSON REGULATED BY A STATE INSURANCE REGULATOR.—The term 'person regulated by a State insurance regulator' has the same meaning as in section 1002(22).

''(6) REGULATED FOREIGN SUBSIDIARY AND REGULATED FOREIGN AFFILIATE.—The terms 'regulated foreign subsidiary' and 'regulated foreign affiliate' mean a person engaged in the business of insurance in a foreign country that is regulated by a foreign insurance regulatory authority that is a member of the International Association of Insurance Supervisors or other comparable foreign insurance regulatory authority as determined by the Board of Governors following consultation with the State insurance regulators, including the lead State insurance commissioner (or similar State official) of the insurance holding company system as determined by the procedures within the Financial Analysis Handbook adopted by the National Association of Insurance Commissioners, where the person, or its principal United States insurance affiliate, has its principal place of business or is domiciled, but only to the extent that—

''(A) such person acts in its capacity as a regulated insurance entity; and

''(B) the Board of Governors does not determine that the capital requirements in a specific foreign jurisdiction are inadequate.

''(7) CAPACITY AS A REGULATED INSURANCE ENTITY.—The term 'capacity as a regulated insurance entity'—

''(A) includes any action or activity undertaken by a person regulated by a State insurance regulator or a regulated foreign subsidiary or regulated foreign affiliate of such person, as those actions relate to the provision of insurance, or other activities necessary to engage in the business of insurance; and

''(B) does not include any action or activity, including any financial activity, that is not regulated by a State insurance regulator or a foreign agency or authority and subject to State insurance capital requirements or, in the case of a regulated foreign subsidiary or regulated foreign affiliate, capital requirements imposed by a foreign insurance regulatory authority.''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(c) CLARIFICATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—In establishing the minimum leverage capital requirements and minimum risk-based capital requirements on a consolidated basis for a depository institution holding company or a nonbank financial company supervised by the Board of Governors as required under paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (b), the appropriate Federal banking agencies shall not be required to include, for any purpose of this section (including in any determination of consolidation), a person regulated by a State insurance regulator or a regulated foreign subsidiary or a regulated foreign affiliate of such person engaged in the business of insurance, to the extent that such person acts in its capacity as a regulated insurance entity.

''(2) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION ON BOARD'S AUTHORITY.—This subsection shall not be construed to prohibit, modify, limit, or otherwise supersede any other provision of Federal law that provides the Board of Governors authority to issue regulations and orders relating to capital requirements for depository institution holding companies or nonbank financial companies supervised by the Board of Governors.

''(3) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION ON ACCOUNTING PRINCIPLES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—A depository institution holding company or nonbank financial company supervised by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve that is also a person regulated by a State insurance regulator that is engaged in the business of insurance that files financial statements with a State insurance regulator or the National Association of Insurance Commissioners utilizing only Statutory Accounting Principles in accordance with State law, shall not be required by the Board under the authority of this section or the authority of the Home Owners' Loan Act to prepare such financial statements in accordance with Generally Accepted Accounting Principles.

''(B) PRESERVATION OF AUTHORITY.—Nothing in subparagraph (A) shall limit the authority of the Board under any other applicable provision of law to conduct any regulatory or supervisory activity of a depository institution holding company or non-bank financial company supervised by the Board of Governors, including the collection or reporting of any information on an entity or group-wide basis. Nothing in this paragraph shall excuse the Board from its obligations to comply with section 161(a) of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (12 U.S.C. 5361(a)) and section 10(b)(2) of the Home Owners' Loan Act (12 U.S.C. 1467a(b)(2)), as appropriate.''.

TITLE II—COLLATERALIZED LOAN OBLIGATIONS

SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Restoring Proven Financing for American Employers Act''.

SEC. 202. RULES OF CONSTRUCTION RELATING TO COLLATERALIZED LOAN OBLIGATIONS.

Section 13(g) of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 (12 U.S.C. 1851(g)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

''(4) COLLATERALIZED LOAN OBLIGATIONS.—

''(A) INAPPLICABILITY TO CERTAIN COLLATERALIZED LOAN OBLIGATIONS.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to require the divestiture, prior to July 21, 2017, of any debt securities of collateralized loan obligations, if such debt securities were issued before January 31, 2014.

''(B) OWNERSHIP INTEREST WITH RESPECT TO COLLATERALIZED LOAN OBLIGATIONS.—A banking entity shall not be considered to have an ownership interest in a collateralized loan obligation because it acquires, has acquired, or retains a debt security in such collateralized loan obligation if the debt security has no indicia of ownership other than the right of the banking entity to participate in the removal for cause, or in the selection of a replacement after removal for cause or resignation, of an investment manager or investment adviser of the collateralized loan obligation.

''(C) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this paragraph:

''(i) COLLATERALIZED LOAN OBLIGATION.—The term 'collateralized loan obligation' means any issuing entity of an asset-backed security, as defined in section 3(a)(77) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78c(a)(77)), that is comprised primarily of commercial loans.

''(ii) REMOVAL FOR CAUSE.—An investment manager or investment adviser shall be deemed to be removed 'for cause' if the investment manager or investment adviser is removed as a result of—

''(I) a breach of a material term of the applicable management or advisory agreement or the agreement governing the collateralized loan obligation;

''(II) the inability of the investment manager or investment adviser to continue to perform its obligations under any such agreement;

''(III) any other action or inaction by the investment manager or investment adviser that has or could reasonably be expected to have a materially adverse effect on the collateralized loan obligation, if the investment manager or investment adviser fails to cure or take reasonable steps to cure such effect within a reasonable time; or

''(IV) a comparable event or circumstance that threatens, or could reasonably be expected to threaten, the interests of holders of the debt securities.''.

TITLE III—DEFINITION OF POINTS AND FEES IN MORTGAGE TRANSACTIONS

SECTION 301. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Mortgage Choice Act of 2014''.

SEC. 302. DEFINITION OF POINTS AND FEES.

(a) AMENDMENT TO SECTION 103 OF TILA.—Section 103(bb)(4) of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1602(bb)(4)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''paragraph (1)(B)'' and inserting ''paragraph (1)(A) and section 129C'';

(2) in subparagraph (C)—

(A) by inserting ''and insurance'' after ''taxes'';

(B) in clause (ii), by inserting '', except as retained by a creditor or its affiliate as a result of their participation in an affiliated business arrangement (as defined in section 2(7) of the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act of 1974 (12 U.S.C. 2602(7))'' after ''compensation''; and

(C) by striking clause (iii) and inserting the following:

''(iii) the charge is—

''(I) a bona fide third-party charge not retained by the mortgage originator, creditor, or an affiliate of the creditor or mortgage originator; or

''(II) a charge set forth in section 106(e)(1);''; and

(3) in subparagraph (D)—

(A) by striking ''accident,''; and

(B) by striking ''or any payments'' and inserting ''and any payments''.

(b) AMENDMENT TO SECTION 129C OF TILA.—Section 129C of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1639c) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(5)(C), by striking ''103'' and all that follows through ''or mortgage originator'' and inserting ''103(bb)(4)''; and

(2) in subsection (b)(2)(C)(i), by striking ''103'' and all that follows through ''or mortgage originator)'' and inserting ''103(bb)(4)''.

SEC. 303. RULEMAKING.

Not later than the end of the 90-day period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection shall issue final regulations to carry out the amendments made by this Act, and such regulations shall be effective upon issuance.

TITLE IV—BUSINESS RISK MITIGATION AND PRICE STABILIZATION

SEC. 401. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Business Risk Mitigation and Price Stabilization Act of 2013''.

SEC. 402. MARGIN REQUIREMENTS.

(a) COMMODITY EXCHANGE ACT AMENDMENT.—Section 4s(e) of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 6s(e)), as added by section 731 of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(4) APPLICABILITY WITH RESPECT TO COUNTERPARTIES.—The requirements of paragraphs (2)(A)(ii) and (2)(B)(ii), including the initial and variation margin requirements imposed by rules adopted pursuant to paragraphs (2)(A)(ii) and (2)(B)(ii), shall not apply to a swap in which a counterparty qualifies for an exception under section 2(h)(7)(A), or an exemption issued under section 4(c)(1) from the requirements of section 2(h)(1)(A) for cooperative entities as defined in such exemption, or satisfies the criteria in section 2(h)(7)(D).''.

(b) SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT AMENDMENT.—Section 15F(e) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78o–10(e)), as added by section 764(a) of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(4) APPLICABILITY WITH RESPECT TO COUNTERPARTIES.—The requirements of paragraphs (2)(A)(ii) and (2)(B)(ii) shall not apply to a security-based swap in which a counterparty qualifies for an exception under section 3C(g)(1) or satisfies the criteria in section 3C(g)(4).''.

SEC. 403. IMPLEMENTATION.

The amendments made by this title to the Commodity Exchange Act shall be implemented—

(1) without regard to—

(A) chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code; and

(B) the notice and comment provisions of section 553 of title 5, United States Code;

(2) through the promulgation of an interim final rule, pursuant to which public comment will be sought before a final rule is issued; and

(3) such that paragraph (1) shall apply solely to changes to rules and regulations, or proposed rules and regulations, that are limited to and directly a consequence of such amendments.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days with which to revise and extend their remarks and submit extraneous materials for the RECORD on H.R. 5461 currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 5461, a bill authored by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR), my colleague on the Financial Services Committee, and cosponsored by Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California and myself.

This bill contains four titles, three of which having already passed this House with overwhelming or unanimous support and one of which passed with only a dozen ''no'' votes.

Mr. Speaker, it is rare that the Senate sends us meaningful legislation; and, frankly, it is even rarer when they send us legislation that amends and fixes the Dodd-Frank Act. As we on the Financial Services Committee have seen in our hearings and our markups, our friends on the other side of the aisle and the other side of the Capitol usually defend Dodd-Frank to the hilt, bestowing on it deference normally reserved for the sacred texts handed down from the heavens.

Well, we should agree that Congress doesn't always get it right. When sweeping legislation is enacted—remember, Dodd-Frank is a 2,300-page bill—there are often areas that later need clarification, and that is exactly what we are talking about here today.

Whatever one's position is on Dodd-Frank, we should all be able to agree that the text is not sacred and does need some fixing. That is why I am pleased that the Senate has sent us a bill to clarify that regulators should not impose regulatory capital requirements designed for banking institutions on insurance companies. That was not what was intended.

The Senate bill, S. 2270, passed the other body unanimously. There is broad support in the House for a companion measure, but there is equally broad support for three other Dodd-Frank technical correction amendments that have previously passed this House: Mr. BARR's bill on the treatment of collateralized loan obligations under the Volcker rule, Mr. GRIMM's bill to exempt end users from derivatives from Dodd-Frank's overreaching margin requirements, and my own bill on how points and fees are treated under Dodd-Frank's onerous qualified mortgage rule.

My legislation that is included in this package is a strong bipartisan provision that modifies and clarifies the way points and fees in a real estate transaction are calculated. This provision is narrowly focused to promote access to affordable mortgage credit without overturning the important consumer protections and sound underwriting requirements that Dodd-Frank's ability to repay provisions has in place.

Homeownership has been a pillar of American life for generations, and this particular provision will help more Americans realize this portion of the American Dream.

This bill is a commonsense measure that should and, I believe, does have broad bipartisan support. I was puzzled, however, by a Dear Colleague letter produced by Ranking Member WATERS circulated earlier today. In the letter, she writes that Mr. BARR has coupled the insurance capital bill with other ''divisive legislation.''

Now, I would ask my friend the ranking member: What divisive legislation are you referring to? Is it the CLO bill which passed the House on voice vote? Is it the end user bill which passed the House on the ranking member's ''yes'' vote herself and only a dozen ''nay'' votes? Or is it my bill that also passed the House by voice vote? I don't see the divisiveness, and I don't see where the problem is.

The reality is Americans don't care about the parliamentary process so much as they want results.

We are pleased that the Senate has finally come to the table on Dodd-Frank reforms. This is legislation that represents a step forward in working with the other body to make sure that my constituents and your constituents can get mortgages to buy their first home, that farmers can assess the financing that they need to buy tractors and work their land, and that Americans can buy insurance policies without severe premium increases.

I encourage my colleagues to support H.R. 5461, especially my Democrats friends who I believe support every component of the package.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, before I begin my remarks, I must correct the gentleman from Michigan when he talked about our unwillingness to look at Dodd-Frank in any critical way and our unwillingness to modify, amend, or do anything to Dodd-Frank. It is absolutely not true.

As a matter of fact, I am recorded time and time again—even in my speech before the Chamber of Commerce, where I have said and I have acted in this manner and in this fashion—that where there were complications, I was willing to work with the opposite side of the aisle to try to deal with those complications so that everybody would understand what was intended. Where there appeared to be conflicts, I would work to undo those conflicts.

I have no problem with changing or modifying or dealing with problems in Dodd-Frank, and I have acted that way time and time again.

Today, I rise to express my disappointment with a Republican Party

that has politicized consensus legislation that would provide real, tangible regulatory relief.

When we began this Congress, Democrats on the House Financial Services Committee and Senate Banking Committee both agreed to support technical fixes to the Dodd-Frank Act that have broad bipartisan support.

In that spirit, the gentlewoman from New York, Representative CAROLYN MCCARTHY, who is on this floor this evening, worked hard, provided leadership, helped to straighten out any confusion, and worked with both sides of the aisle to come together in a consensus around the legislation that we are going to hear so much about.

I worked with Mrs. MCCARTHY. I worked with both sides of the aisle also. We came up with targeted, bipartisan insurance capital standards, and we fixed it, and our hard work paid off.

After months of holding hearings and building consensus, we delivered to our chairman a bill with no opposition. Democrats and Republicans supported the measure, as did outside experts on financial reform and the financial services industry.

It was a bill that unanimously passed the Senate, a bill that represented the kind of work Congress should be doing. In other words, Mr. Speaker, virtually no one opposed these reasonable changes to insurance capital standards; but, instead of passing the measure, this noncontroversial technical change has been ''repackaged'' into a broader and more controversial bill by attaching provisions that make substantive changes to Dodd-Frank that, unlike the insurance capital standards fix, are nontechnical in nature and are not universally supported.

The reality is, by circumventing and politicizing the process, this commonsense legislation is going nowhere in the United States Senate. Countless Senate Democrats have made clear that any changes to Dodd-Frank must be targeted and have overwhelming bipartisan support; and Republicans, like Senator COLLINS, whose contributions to the Dodd-Frank Act we are fixing today, are opposed to it as well.

Her statement was unequivocal, saying, ''I would hate for a bill, after many months to have achieved consensus, to get bogged down in unrelated issues.'' She went on to say, ''This isn't reopening a major issue in Dodd-Frank. It is simply bringing clarity to a provision that I authored that the Fed has misinterpreted. I think, given how closely we've worked with everyone, it really is more of a technical correction.''

Senator JOHANNS, another author of the ''clean'' Senate bill, also wants to see an up-or-down vote on the House side; and he said, ''My hope is that we can do this in a straightforward way and get it done.'' He went on to say, if changes were made to the bill, he has to ''start all over.''

Mr. Speaker, this Congress has been infamous for its inability to get anything done; but, on this one issue, we have managed to get the policy right and get incredibly broad support. We have a clear path to getting something done; but, unfortunately, the chairman has decided to throw a wrench in the works at the last minute for no reason.

Finally, it is clear that this is an exercise in political theater. It is well-known and widely reported that Republican leadership has privately told insurance industry stakeholders that they would bring up a ''clean'' insurance capital standards bill after the midterm elections.

It simply shows the disgraceful nature of this debate and the partisan, dilatory tactics that create more distrust in the political process. Rather than do what is right and enact legislation that everyone has agreed on, the chairman has decided to create a fight where there was none.

Make no mistake, but for the chairman's intransigence, the insurance capital fix bill could be on the President's desk for a signature tomorrow.

I oppose this bill due to the particularly flagrant affront to bipartisan efforts to fix narrow issues in the Wall Street Reform Act, an important and complex bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 2045

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

I wish I had actually asked if the gentlewoman would yield because I am confused. I am confused on a bill that she has voted three times—I am positive—three different bills, how that is divisive, how it is not targeted with significant Democrat support.

I personally with one of these bills—my bill has been sitting in the Senate since June. It has been targeted, it has had Democrat support, and it has had Republican support. We simply cannot get the Senate to move, and I am not sure why my colleague would support a Senate bill without any House input, but not expect the Senate to look at our material and to look at our bills.

Mr. Speaker, with that, I yield now as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR) the author of this legislation.

Mr. BARR. Well, I thank the gentleman from Michigan for his leadership on title III of this package and the Mortgage Choice Act, and I appreciate the gentleman's yielding so that we can talk about why every Member of Congress should support this package of reforms.

Before I get to the substance, I do also want to thank the ranking member, thank her for voicing support for the underlying policies in this legislation. I want to thank her for expressing absolutely no concern about the substance of the policy in her remarks, and I would also like to thank the ranking member for her recognition that the Dodd-Frank law may very well have flaws, even for those who adamantly supported the passage of the bill, and for her acknowledgement that she would have no problem changing or dealing with some of the flaws of the Dodd-Frank law. Well, this is our chance, Mr. Speaker. This is the chance to deal with those flaws.

The legislation on the floor tonight is a package of four commonsense financial services bills that all share a common theme. They all have proven bipartisan support. They all have passed either the House or the Senate with unanimous or near-unanimous support, and, most importantly—put aside all of this procedure here—they all promote jobs.

They all promote durable economic growth in this country, and Members on both sides of the aisle and Members in both this Chamber and in the Senate agree about that. Let's stop the games in Washington, and let's get the American people back to work. That is what we have an opportunity to do here in a bipartisan way; so I call on my colleagues to support this bill.

This is a simple 14-page bill that is about fixing unintended consequences of the Dodd-Frank law. These fixes are technical corrections, and they are meant to clarify provisions in the law where, although congressional intent was clear, the authority provided by the statutory language led some regulators to enact or promulgate economically destructive regulations.

The four titles of this legislative package represent the hard work of a number of Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle. Let me just go through those really quickly. Title I of the legislation is an important provision that clarifies the capital requirements applied to insurance companies subject to Federal Reserve Board supervision.

Mr. HUIZENGA did a good job explaining what this title does; but, just in summary, it is important that the capital rules for insurance companies are carefully tailored to the business of insurance rather than arbitrarily holding insurance companies to standards that are meant for banks.

I want to thank Congressman GARY MILLER, a Republican from California, Congresswoman MALONEY, a Democrat from New York, for their leadership—bipartisan leadership—for this Insurance Capital Standards Clarification Act and for helping push this provision forward.

I would also like to further emphasize the bipartisan and noncontroversial nature of this title by noting that the Senate version of the Insurance Capital Standards Clarification Act passed the Senate by unanimous consent on June 3.

Then there is title II. Title II is the text of a bill that I introduced in March which passed the House by a voice vote. This was a bill that no one opposed. This was a bill that simply incorporates bipartisan provisions of the Restoring Proven Financing for American Employers Act, and it is about jobs.

It is about restoring a robust and dependable commercial lending market to U.S. companies so that they can obtain affordable financing to expand their businesses.

Collateralized loan obligations, known as CLOs, have proven to be a critical source of funding for U.S. businesses for over 20 years. Today's CLOs continue to provide $300 billion in financing to U.S. companies on Main Street, including companies that are well-known to all of us in this room: Dunkin' Donuts, American Airlines, Burger King, Toys R Us, Delta Airlines, Goodyear Tire, and even a mattress company in Lexington, Kentucky, my home district, Tempur Sealy.

Because of this innovative source of financing, U.S. employers have expanded, jobs have been created, and our economy has grown; and, despite a proven track record with a default rate below even a half a percent, this valuable form of corporate finance is under assault because of the Volcker rule.

Further relief from the Volcker rule for these CLOs is necessary to prevent a fire sale in the CLO market that will cause significant losses for banks of all size. This defined, narrow fix which clarifies that the Volcker rule should not be construed to require the divestiture of any debt securities of CLOs prior to July 21, 2017, if such CLOs were issued before January 31, 2014, is a commonsense solution.

It clarifies that a bank shall not be considered to have an ownership interest in a CLO if such debt security has no indicia of ownership other than the right to participate in the removal for cause in the selection of a replacement investment manager or investment adviser of the CLO.

This title is a bipartisan commonsense fix to a real-world problem voiced by community banks and by companies on Main Street that want access to this affordable and reliable source of commercial credit. It prevents an unnecessary fire sale in the CLO market that would cause significant losses to banks currently holding these legacy CLOs, and it will help keep the cost of borrowing affordable in the future for Main Street U.S. businesses looking to expand, grow, and create much-needed jobs.

I want to personally thank Congresswoman MALONEY and Ranking Member WATERS for working with me to enact a CLO fix so that it could pass by a voice vote in April.

Then, also, title III, this is the fix that Congressman HUIZENGA helped pass, and Congressman HUIZENGA worked in a bipartisan way with Congressman MEEKS to support this Mortgage Choice Act, and it passed the House by a voice vote—not a single objection—on June 19, and I won't go over the details which Congressman HUIZENGA has done well, but I will say that this measure will greatly advance our efforts to help the housing market and our economy recover as Members on both sides of the aisle have demonstrated with their support and supporting it by voice vote.

Finally, title IV, this is the fourth and final title of this package, and it is a provision that has broad support for Main Street and businesses of all sizes. Like other provisions of this package, title IV is meant to alleviate the unintended consequences created by Dodd-Frank. It is a technical fix that has proven bipartisan support and passed the House on June 12 with 411 votes in favor.

The provision simply clarifies and codifies congressional intent that Dodd-Frank was not supposed to impose margin requirements on end user derivative transactions. We are talking about nonfinancial companies that produce goods for the American people and simply use derivatives to hedge against commercial risk.

This provision is not about speculation. It is about promoting responsible risk-management practices among U.S. companies. In fact, failure to enact this provision could lead to more risk as companies may be deterred from engaging in hedging transactions.

It requires them to needlessly tie up capital that could otherwise be used to do more productive things like expand operating plants, perform research and product development, and ultimately create jobs. Again, this is a provision that previously passed the House with near unanimous support.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, what do we have here today? We have a package of four bills, 14 pages, unlike the 2,300 pages in Dodd-Frank—14 pages, each of which of these four bills—overwhelmingly bipartisan—each of which are vital to preserving and creating jobs, each of which are noncontroversial in nature, and two of these provisions previously passed the House by voice vote, a third passed with 411 votes, and the fourth is a commonsense critically important solution for the 75 million American families that rely on life insurance for financial and retirement security, a bill that passed the Senate by unanimous consent.

The substance and the policy behind these bills are bipartisan. It is solid. I would certainly expect that, if you would support the underlying policy, then you would support this commonsense package of bills to promote jobs and durable economic growth.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I am so proud to yield as much time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY), a distinguished member of the Financial Services Committee. She is a woman that has worked hard to bring a clear bill to the floor.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Just for the record, when my colleague was speaking, my name is CAROLYN MCCARTHY, not CAROLYN MALONEY, just so we clarify that, and I want to thank Ms. WATERS. I want to thank the ranking member on Financial Services.

I have a speech here, but I need to clarify a few things. I am not sure, my memory has not been good since I was sick, but I was on Financial Services when we did Dodd-Frank, and we worked very hard, bipartisanly, on that committee, and we saw the problems on some of the language, and we corrected them bipartisanly.

We made sure that when we were dealing with derivatives, that it didn't have the language that you are complaining about. That came from the Senate side.

When we are talking about the insurance companies and making it easier to make sure they could do their job and not be treated like a bank, we got the language here on the House side. Again, the Senate side misinterprets some and had the wrong language. GARY MILLER and I have been working a year—over a year—to make the corrections that are coming out today.

Now, I support everything that we are going to be voting on, but I am reluctant about it because talking to my colleagues on the Senate side, they have said that they will not do it; so something that you all want has a really good chance of never seeing the light of day. Maybe next year. That is fine. Whom are you hurting, and what are you proving? Mainly because, now, the insurance companies are going to be in limbo. We don't know what is going to happen; so you are putting off something again.

I am ending my career here in Congress. I will be retiring, and I have to say, for 18 years, I have worked bipartisanly, and I have gotten a lot of things done, and I hope to continue to get some things done between now and when I retire, but I also think what I have seen here is this politicking that words are said and people don't get to know each other.

Now, the audience might not understand everything that is going on here on the floor, but I do believe that what we have done on Dodd-Frank—and, now, yes, there are technical changes; but, to be very honest with you, in 18 years, I do not remember any bill—major bill—being passed here, going through the Senate, that didn't come back for technical changes.

We are not perfect. As many times as people want to think we are, we are not. We are human beings; and, unfortunately, we do not take the time to legislate and to work things out as we have done in the past. I am not blaming Republicans, and I am not blaming Democrats.

We have got good people on both sides of the aisle, and it hurts me terribly to see this going on when everybody should be working together for the country, not whether you are a Republican or a Democrat.

There are many of us who care very much about getting jobs. There are many of us that care to get everybody forward, and I think that is something that people have to start realizing. We have so many members on your side of the aisle and members on our side of the aisle that have been friends for

years and years, and you have got to learn to work together. You can have your opinions, and we have ours, but you have got to sit down and work together.

I know the big word around here is don't compromise. It is not compromising. It is trying to represent all of our constituents for the whole country.

□ 2100

And Ms. WATERS is absolutely right. She worked very hard during Dodd-Frank, as many of your Republican colleagues did. But it was GARY MILLER and I who have been working with the Senate for over a year and to see this bill come onto the floor, which is going to pass, and it will pass. What upsets me is it is not going to go anywhere in the Senate. Another bill will die. And there is no reason for it. 204 Members bipartisanly want to see the Capital Standards Clarification Act of 2014 passed.

I understand where you want to put everything together so you see it is efficient. Sometimes you have to know how the Senate works so that we can be efficient and work with them as we go forward because, if had you done that, you would hear Republicans and Democrats in the Senate and their aides who are saying, This is not the way it is done. That is why we are upset.

When you have so many people working on this, many of your colleagues, my colleagues signing on to having it done, and now we are going to see, most likely, it die or put off until next year, which is really a shame because the companies you are talking about, everything you are talking about as far as the jobs bills and everything else like that, I would like to see that signed by the President tomorrow. That ain't going to happen now, and it is not going to happen now.

So what I will say is Ms. WATERS is correct, but I will vote for this bill tomorrow. Many of my colleagues will vote for this bill tomorrow because we are hoping we will go forward. But in my heart of hearts, because I have been around here too long, I don't think the Senate is going to pass it, and that is a shame because that is what you are working for. That is what we are working for. But the Senate's procedures do not do it.

They will take a stand-alone bill. And from what I understand, Mr. MILLER and I will hopefully introduce a stand-alone bill in the next few days, because if this dies in the Senate, we will take up the Senate bill, which is our bill, and hopefully get a vote here and have the President sign it within a few days.

Mr. Speaker, tonight the House is considering the Insurance Capital Standards Clarification Act of 2014 under suspension of the rules.

This bill contains four Financial Services Bills including S. 2270.

I am pleased to be the lead democrat on H.R. 4510, the House companion to S. 2270, the Insurance Capital Standards Clarification Act of 2014. However, this is not the same bill that we will be voting on.

Though I will reluctantly support the bill, I am disappointed in the process and believe that S. 2270 should have been brought up as a stand-alone bill, rather than combined with three other bills which have already passed the House. The Senate has indicated they would need to start all over if changes were made to the original bill.

Ranking Member WATERS rightly objected to this procedure last week yet her concerns were ignored.

S. 2270 supports a more precise application of capital standards that furthers the interests of strong prudential supervision. This legislation grants the Federal Reserve the appropriate flexibility to apply accurate capital standards for insurers. This bill will help keep insurance products affordable and available by ensuring the correct capital standards are applied to insurance companies that fall under the supervision of the Federal Reserve.

This House version already has 204 bipartisan cosponsors and S. 2270 would easily pass under suspension. This bill has already passed the Senate by unanimous consent. Passing S. 2270 on its own in the House would have sent the bill directly to the president's desk.

Instead, the Financial Services committee majority leadership has insisted on combining four bills and using our title, even though this is different legislation. This creates uncertainty as to the future of the original bill.

I will support the Insurance Capital Standards Clarification Act of 2014 on the floor tonight and urge my colleagues to do the same. However, I am disappointed in the process that has been used. Had S. 2270 been passed as a stand-alone bill, it would have been sent directly to the President's desk. Instead, we will likely have to vote on S. 2270 as a stand-alone bill during the lame duck session, which is already filled with a long list of remaining actions.

The House delay in passing this bill is causing uncertainty for insurance companies who cannot plan for the future of their businesses without knowing the appropriate capital standards. I encourage my colleagues to cosponsor H.R. 4510, the House version of S. 2270, so that we can reach 218 cosponsors and bring this to the floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to my colleague from Kentucky (Mr. BARR), who would like to clarify.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and I thank the gentlewoman for her comments. I appreciate what she is saying about bipartisanship. Let me just make sure I clarify. I was referring to Congresswoman MALONEY on the legislation that she and I worked on together, the CLO bill. So, in a very bipartisan way, I worked with her on that.

But to the substance of the gentlewoman's remarks, I appreciate what she is saying, absolutely, and that is what is such a shame about this whole situation because we have four bills that have been worked on in a bipartisan way. There shouldn't be any controversy about this whatsoever.

Let's do the business of the American people, get them back to work. Pass these bipartisan bills.

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

I am curious why we are here. The House of Representatives is only going to pass Senate bills. I am curious why my colleagues would be willing to do that. I would love to hear from my colleagues, which overwhelmingly passed House bill does the Senate object to? We simply cannot get them to take our bills up.

I am glad to hear that my colleague, Mrs. MCCARTHY, is going to be supporting this bill package. I too am hopeful. But I do believe that this is not political theater, for the robust list of supporters, like credit unions, banks, insurers of all sizes, the entire real estate community and end-users strongly support the policies that are within this bill. And I do have that list available as well, which I will include for the RECORD.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close, and with that, I reserve the balance of my time.

SEPTEMBER 15, 2014.

DEAR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS: The undersigned trade associations, representing job creators across the country of all shapes and sizes, write to urge your support for bipartisan legislation recently introduced by Reps. Andy Barr (R–KY), Gary Miller (R–CA), Bill Huizenga (R–MI), and David Scott (D–GA). H.R. 5461, currently scheduled for floor consideration on Monday, September 15th, includes important technical corrections to the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act that strengthen the underlying Act and provide critical clarifications to better oversee our financial system while allowing for economic growth.

The ongoing implementation of the Dodd-Frank Act has revealed unintended consequences that have adversely impacted job creation and economic growth. We believe that the Barr-Miller bill, comprised of a series of noncontroversial, thoroughly examined, bipartisan proposals will fix these unintended consequences and help make financial reform more workable and effective. Specifically, this legislation contains the text of three bills previously approved by the House (H.R. 634, the Business Risk Mitigation and Price Stabilization Act; H.R. 3211, the Mortgage Choice Act; H.R. 4167, the Restoring Proven Financing for American Employers Act) as well as one bill that recently passed the Senate (S. 2270, the Insurance Capital Standards Clarification Act) by unanimous consent. In fact, three of the four titles of this package have previously passed either the House or Senate without one dissenting vote.

We urge your support for the Barr-Miller-Huizenga-Scott bill to help foster job creation and economic growth.

Signed,

American Bankers Association; American Bankers Insurance Association (ABIA); American Financial Services Association; American Insurance Association; Consumer Bankers Association; Consumer Mortgage Coalition; Community Mortgage Lenders of America; Credit Union National Association; The Financial Services Roundtable; The Financial Services Forum; Independent Community Bankers of America; Leading Builders of America; The Loan Syndications and

Trading Association; Mortgage Bankers Association; National Association of Federal Credit Unions; National Association of Home Builders; National Association of Mutual Insurance Companies; National Association of Realtors; The Realty Alliance; Real Estate Services Providers Council, Inc. (RESPRO); Securities Industry and Financial Markets Association; U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time I have left?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from California has 7½ minutes remaining.

Ms. WATERS. Oh, very good. I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON).

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, the bill we took up before this one, on Father Flanagan, that is the kind of bill that we should be doing on suspension calendar. In fact, the heart of this particular bill is noncontroversial, and I think a lot of people would be looking forward to just voting up the Insurance Capital Standards Clarification Act.

I think a lot of people would like to just get this bill up, pass it, and send it right to the President. We could do that. Unfortunately, this bill, even if it does have bipartisan support, has been loaded up with other bills, and the Senate has indicated that they are not going to take it up.

So, to the gentleman's point from Michigan, we are not just here to pass Senate bills—that is a fair point of view to hold—but it is a matter of pragmatic legislative action. This is the bill we could have passed and could be passed into law and signed by the President. So to pack this bill up even with bipartisan legislation slows it up, which delays good outcomes for people who could have them.

In my opinion, that is unwise and ill-advised, and I am very sorry that the President is not going to get the Insurance Capital Standards Clarification Act on his desk because he certainly could if there was a spirit of cooperation.

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close, Mr. Speaker, and reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY).

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. What I was trying to explain to you, it is not that we are giving up our power from here to the Senate. The Senate will not accept everything as a package because they have to change all their language, and that is not going to happen.

They will send back here a stand-alone bill, probably pass the other package—that is fine—but they are not going to change or open it up. That is what I meant to tell you, that you have to understand how the Senate works, and the House is totally different. That is all I am saying, and that is why this bill might die, unfortunately, over in the Senate, because they are not going to get to it because, let's face it, we have too much to do between now and when we come back for a lameduck session.

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, again, I am prepared to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker and Members, I think the argument that we had a piece of legislation here authored by Mrs. MCCARTHY and Mr. MILLER that truly had bipartisan support, that had been worked on so long and so hard by the gentlewoman from New York, that could have passed, and it should have, not been placed in this controversial position. This bill should have been a clean bill that was put forth in a way that would allow the Senate to support it, and to place it—well, the Senate—we would put this on the President's desk if, in fact, we just passed this bill out as a clean bill. It is quite unfortunate.

My colleagues can say all that they want to say about jobs and creating jobs. They talked about bills that had been supported in the committee and bills that had even been supported on the floor. Why are you bringing them back again? Why are you repackaging them? Why are you taking bills that you are identifying as having had all this great support and passed off the floor, passed out of committee, why are you repackaging them? I will tell you why you are repackaging them: because you are trying to create this picture that somehow you have this great jobs bill, that somehow you have worked in some extraordinary ways to put together, despite the fact that you are just repackaging bills that, as you said, had support.

The gentleman from Michigan said he is confused. Yes, I think you are, and I think you are confusing others, and that is my point. My point is it doesn't matter whether or not we have bills that were jointly supported or passed out of committee or passed off the floor. This process and this procedure that you are employing is one that is not fair to the Members of this House.

You are putting forth a process that is complex, that is not easily understood, and now the Members who come to the floor, if they have to take a vote, are going to try to decide did I support that or didn't I support that.

I think that the way that you are doing this is somewhat dangerous; and I can just envision that for the future that we may have a situation where you will hold all of the bills that perhaps do not have bipartisan support, and again you will package them with maybe one bill, as you are doing with this one, with support, and we will never have an opportunity to have the kind of debate and amendments that we should have.

It is about process. It is about procedure. It is about making sure the American people understand what we are doing and how we are doing it. It is not about being slick. It is not about being cute. It is not about trying to take the process and package it in such a way that you can get what you want with a big title of jobs to make people think you have done something new, creative, and extraordinary.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

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

I will address my remarks to the Chair, but, again, this is not about parliamentary procedure. This is about results.

The only bill that we will see here that may bring confusion to this entire process is the one that my colleagues are advocating for, the Senate bill. It is the only bill that we haven't dealt with in committee. It is the only bill we haven't had a vote on in the Houses. The other three bills have passed, two of them unanimously by voice vote, and the other one had 12 people, out of a body of 435, vote against it. Sounds like it is overwhelming. If it is that confusing to my colleagues to figure out what bill and how they voted for it when they come to the floor to vote on this package, they maybe should reconsider their current line of work. This should not be that tough.

This is, again, something that we need to move forward on. The political theater that seems to be happening here is on the other side. I am not sure why, if it is about trying to play to a base for an election issue or what, but this is the one time I think in the history of my working career that the whole is worse than the sum of its parts. This doesn't make any sense.

So there has not been bipartisan work on the underlying bill, Dodd-Frank, which I might remind my colleagues passed with zero minority Republican votes when the bill was passed. This package of bills has passed with overwhelming bipartisan support. I applaud my colleagues on the other side of the aisle when they oppose the Senate.

And I guess I needed to clarify that my comments about people acting like this is holy writ from the heavens does tend to be concentrated with my colleagues over in the Senate who apparently don't want to touch this or others in the administration who oppose the nine-bill package on derivatives reform that passed overwhelmingly bipartisanly out of our committee as well.

That is the kind of holdup that we have that is frustrating Americans, that is frustrating me as a policymaker and my colleagues, that is frustrating, frankly, future generations as they look in on this process.

It is time, Mr. Speaker, to pass this package of bills that includes three bills that this House has already dealt

with, that the Senate should have absolutely no opposition to or excuse why they will not take up.

With that, I again ask my colleagues to pass this particular bill, H.R. 5461, and look forward to its passage here soon.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 2115

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5461.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Ms. WATERS. 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 motion will be postponed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 124, CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2015

Mr. COLE (during consideration of H.R. 5461), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113–600) on the resolution (H. Res. 722) providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 124) making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2015, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REVITALIZE AMERICAN MANUFACTURING AND INNOVATION ACT OF 2014

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2996) to require the Secretary of Commerce to establish the Network for Manufacturing Innovation and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2996

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 ''Revitalize American Manufacturing and Innovation Act of 2014''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) In 2012, manufacturers contributed $2.03 trillion to the economy, or ⅛ of United States Gross Domestic Product.

(2) For every $1.00 spent in manufacturing, another $1.32 is added to the economy, the highest multiplier effect of any economic sector.

(3) Manufacturing supports an estimated 17,400,000 jobs in the United States—about 1 in 6 private-sector jobs. More than 12,000,000 Americans (or 9 percent of the workforce) are employed directly in manufacturing.

(4) In 2012, the average manufacturing worker in the United States earned $77,505 annually, including pay and benefits. The average worker in all industries earned $62,063.

(5) Taken alone, manufacturing in the United States would be the 8th largest economy in the world.

(6) Manufacturers in the United States perform two-thirds of all private-sector research and development in the United States, driving more innovation than any other sector.

SEC. 3. ESTABLISHMENT OF NETWORK FOR MANUFACTURING INNOVATION.

The National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 271 et seq.) is amended—

(1) by redesignating section 34 as section 35; and

(2) by inserting after section 33 (15 U.S.C. 278r) the following:

''SEC. 34. NETWORK FOR MANUFACTURING INNOVATION.

''(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF NETWORK FOR MANUFACTURING INNOVATION PROGRAM.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish within the Institute a program to be known as the 'Network for Manufacturing Innovation Program' (referred to in this section as the 'Program').

''(2) PURPOSES OF PROGRAM.—The purposes of the Program are—

''(A) to improve the competitiveness of United States manufacturing and to increase the production of goods manufactured predominantly within the United States;

''(B) to stimulate United States leadership in advanced manufacturing research, innovation, and technology;

''(C) to facilitate the transition of innovative technologies into scalable, cost-effective, and high-performing manufacturing capabilities;

''(D) to facilitate access by manufacturing enterprises to capital-intensive infrastructure, including high-performance electronics and computing, and the supply chains that enable these technologies;

''(E) to accelerate the development of an advanced manufacturing workforce;

''(F) to facilitate peer exchange of and the documentation of best practices in addressing advanced manufacturing challenges;

''(G) to leverage non-Federal sources of support to promote a stable and sustainable business model without the need for long-term Federal funding; and

''(H) to create and preserve jobs.

''(3) SUPPORT.—The Secretary, acting through the Director, shall carry out the purposes set forth in paragraph (2) by supporting—

''(A) the Network for Manufacturing Innovation established under subsection (b); and

''(B) the establishment of centers for manufacturing innovation.

''(4) DIRECTOR.—The Secretary shall carry out the Program through the Director.

''(b) ESTABLISHMENT OF NETWORK FOR MANUFACTURING INNOVATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—As part of the Program, the Secretary shall establish a network of centers for manufacturing innovation.

''(2) DESIGNATION.—The network established under paragraph (1) shall be known as the 'Network for Manufacturing Innovation' (referred to in this section as the 'Network').

''(c) CENTERS FOR MANUFACTURING INNOVATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this section, a 'center for manufacturing innovation' is a center that—

''(A) has been established by a person or group of persons to address challenges in advanced manufacturing and to assist manufacturers in retaining or expanding industrial production and jobs in the United States;

''(B) has a predominant focus on a manufacturing process, novel material, enabling technology, supply chain integration methodology, or another relevant aspect of advanced manufacturing, such as nanotechnology applications, advanced ceramics, photonics and optics, composites, biobased and advanced materials, flexible hybrid technologies, and tool development for microelectronics;

''(C) as determined by the Secretary, has the potential—

''(i) to improve the competitiveness of United States manufacturing, including key advanced manufacturing technologies such as nanotechnology, advanced ceramics, photonics and optics, composites, biobased and advanced materials, flexible hybrid technologies, and tool development for microelectronics;

''(ii) to accelerate non-Federal investment in advanced manufacturing production capacity in the United States; or

''(iii) to enable the commercial application of new technologies or industry-wide manufacturing processes; and

''(D) includes active participation among representatives from multiple industrial entities, research universities, community colleges, and such other entities as the Secretary considers appropriate, which may include industry-led consortia, career and technical education schools, Federal laboratories, State, local, and tribal governments, businesses, educational institutions, and nonprofit organizations.

''(2) ACTIVITIES.—Activities of a center for manufacturing innovation may include the following:

''(A) Research, development, and demonstration projects, including proof-of-concept development and prototyping, to reduce the cost, time, and risk of commercializing new technologies and improvements in existing technologies, processes, products, and research and development of materials to solve precompetitive industrial problems with economic or national security implications.

''(B) Development and implementation of education, training, and workforce recruitment courses, materials, and programs.

''(C) Development of innovative methodologies and practices for supply chain integration and introduction of new technologies into supply chains.

''(D) Outreach and engagement with small and medium-sized manufacturing enterprises, including women and minority owned manufacturing enterprises, in addition to large manufacturing enterprises.

''(E) Such other activities as the Secretary, in consultation with Federal departments and agencies whose missions contribute to or are affected by advanced manufacturing, considers consistent with the purposes described in subsection (a)(2).

''(3) ADDITIONAL CENTERS FOR MANUFACTURING INNOVATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The National Additive Manufacturing Innovation Institute and other manufacturing centers formally recognized as manufacturing innovation centers pursuant to Federal law or executive actions, or under pending interagency review for such recognition as of the date of enactment of the Revitalize American Manufacturing and Innovation Act of 2014, shall be considered centers for manufacturing innovation, but such centers shall not receive any financial assistance under subsection (d).

''(B) NETWORK PARTICIPATION.—A manufacturing center that is substantially similar to those established under this subsection but that does not receive financial assistance under subsection (d) may, upon request of the center, be recognized as a center for manufacturing innovation by the Secretary for purposes of participation in the Network.

''(d) FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO ESTABLISH AND SUPPORT CENTERS FOR MANUFACTURING INNOVATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out the Program, the Secretary shall award financial assistance to a person or group of persons to assist the organization in planning, establishing, or supporting a center for manufacturing innovation.

''(2) APPLICATION.—A person or group of persons seeking financial assistance under paragraph (1) shall submit to the Secretary an application therefor at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary may require. The application shall, at a minimum, describe the specific sources and amounts of non-Federal financial support for the center on the date financial assistance is sought, as well as the anticipated sources and amounts of non-Federal financial support during the period for which the center could be eligible for continued Federal financial assistance under this section.

''(3) OPEN PROCESS.—In soliciting applications for financial assistance under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall ensure an open process that will allow for the consideration of all applications relevant to advanced manufacturing regardless of technology area.

''(4) SELECTION.—

''(A) COMPETITIVE, MERIT REVIEW.—In awarding financial assistance under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall use a competitive, merit review process that includes peer review by a diverse group of individuals with relevant expertise from both the private and public sectors.

''(B) PARTICIPATION IN PROCESS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—No political appointee may participate on a peer review panel. The Secretary shall implement a conflict of interest policy that ensures public transparency and accountability, and requires full disclosure of any real or potential conflicts of interest on the parts of individuals that participate in the merit selection process.

''(ii) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this subparagraph, the term 'political appointee' means any individual who—

''(I) is employed in a position described under sections 5312 through 5316 of title 5, United States Code, (relating to the Executive Schedule);

''(II) is a limited term appointee, limited emergency appointee, or noncareer appointee in the Senior Executive Service, as defined under paragraphs (5), (6), and (7), respectively, of section 3132(a) of title 5, United States Code; or

''(III) is employed in a position in the executive branch of the Government of a confidential or policy-determining character under schedule C of subpart C of part 213 of title 5 of the Code of Federal Regulations.

''(C) PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT, TRANSPARENCY, AND ACCOUNTABILITY.—For each award of financial assistance under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall—

''(i) make publicly available at the time of the award a description of the bases for the award, including an explanation of the relative merits of the winning applicant as compared to other applications received, if applicable; and

''(ii) develop and implement metrics-based performance measures to assess the effectiveness of the activities funded.

''(D) COLLABORATION.—In awarding financial assistance under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall, acting through the National Program Office established under subsection (f)(1), collaborate with Federal departments and agencies whose missions contribute to or are affected by advanced manufacturing.

''(E) CONSIDERATIONS.—In selecting a person who submitted an application under paragraph (2) for an award of financial assistance under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall consider, at a minimum, the following:

''(i) The potential of the center for manufacturing innovation to advance domestic manufacturing and the likelihood of economic impact, including the creation or preservation of jobs, in the predominant focus areas of the center for manufacturing innovation.

''(ii) The commitment of continued financial support, advice, participation, and other contributions from non-Federal sources, to provide leverage and resources to promote a stable and sustainable business model without the need for long-term Federal funding.

''(iii) Whether the financial support provided to the center for manufacturing innovation from non-Federal sources significantly exceeds the requested Federal financial assistance.

''(iv) How the center for manufacturing innovation will increase the non-Federal investment in advanced manufacturing research in the United States.

''(v) How the center for manufacturing innovation will engage with small and medium-sized manufacturing enterprises, to improve the capacity of such enterprises to commercialize new processes and technologies.

''(vi) How the center for manufacturing innovation will carry out educational and workforce activities that meet industrial needs related to the predominant focus areas of the center.

''(vii) How the center for manufacturing innovation will advance economic competitiveness and generate substantial benefits to the Nation that extend beyond the direct return to participants in the Program.

''(viii) Whether the predominant focus of the center for manufacturing innovation is a manufacturing process, novel material, enabling technology, supply chain integration methodology, or other relevant aspect of advanced manufacturing that has not already been commercialized, marketed, distributed, or sold by another entity.

''(ix) How the center for manufacturing innovation will strengthen and leverage the assets of a region.

''(x) How the center for manufacturing will encourage the education and training of veterans and individuals with disabilities.

''(5) LIMITATIONS ON AWARDS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—No award of financial assistance may be made under paragraph (1) to a center of manufacturing innovation after the 7-year period beginning on the date on which the Secretary first awards financial assistance to that center under that paragraph.

''(B) MATCHING FUNDS AND PREFERENCES.—The total Federal financial assistance awarded to a center of manufacturing innovation, including the financial assistance under paragraph (1), in a given year shall not exceed 50 percent of the total funding of the center in that year, except that the Secretary may make an exception in the case of large capital facilities or equipment purchases. The Secretary shall give weighted preference to applicants seeking less than the maximum Federal share of funds allowed under this paragraph.

''(C) FUNDING DECREASE.—The amount of financial assistance provided to a center of manufacturing innovation under paragraph (1) shall decrease after the second year of funding for the center, and shall continue to decrease thereafter in each year in which financial assistance is provided, unless the Secretary determines that—

''(i) the center is otherwise meeting its stated goals and metrics under this section;

''(ii) unforeseen circumstances have altered the center's anticipated funding; and

''(iii) the center can identify future non-Federal funding sources that would warrant a temporary exemption from the limitations established in this subparagraph.

''(e) FUNDING.—

''(1) GENERAL RULE.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), no funds are authorized to be appropriated by the Revitalize American Manufacturing and Innovation Act of 2014 for carrying out this section.

''(2) AUTHORITY.—

''(A) NIST INDUSTRIAL TECHNICAL SERVICES ACCOUNT.—To the extent provided for in advance by appropriations Acts, the Secretary may use not to exceed $5,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2015 through 2024 to carry out this section from amounts appropriated to the Institute for Industrial Technical Services.

''(B) ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND RENEWABLE ENERGY ACCOUNT.—To the extent provided for in advance by appropriations Acts, the Secretary of Energy may transfer to the Institute not to exceed $250,000,000 for the period encompassing fiscal years 2015 through 2024 for the Secretary to carry out this section from amounts appropriated for advanced manufacturing research and development within the Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy account for the Department of Energy.

''(f) NATIONAL PROGRAM OFFICE.—

''(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary shall establish, within the Institute, the National Office of the Network for Manufacturing Innovation Program (referred to in this section as the 'National Program Office'), which shall oversee and carry out the Program.

''(2) FUNCTIONS.—The functions of the National Program Office are—

''(A) to oversee the planning, management, and coordination of the Program;

''(B) to enter into memorandums of understanding with Federal departments and agencies whose missions contribute to or are affected by advanced manufacturing, to carry out the purposes described in subsection (a)(2);

''(C) to develop, not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Revitalize American Manufacturing and Innovation Act of 2014, and update not less frequently than once every 3 years thereafter, a strategic plan to guide the Program;

''(D) to establish such procedures, processes, and criteria as may be necessary and appropriate to maximize cooperation and coordinate the activities of the Program with programs and activities of other Federal departments and agencies whose missions contribute to or are affected by advanced manufacturing;

''(E) to establish a clearinghouse of public information related to the activities of the Program; and

''(F) to act as a convener of the Network.

''(3) RECOMMENDATIONS.—In developing and updating the strategic plan under paragraph (2)(C), the Secretary shall solicit recommendations and advice from a wide range of stakeholders, including industry, small and medium-sized manufacturing enterprises, research universities, community colleges, and other relevant organizations and institutions on an ongoing basis.

''(4) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Upon completion, the Secretary shall transmit the strategic plan required under paragraph (2)(C) to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives.

''(5) HOLLINGS MANUFACTURING EXTENSION PARTNERSHIP.—The Secretary shall ensure that the National Program Office incorporates the Hollings Manufacturing Extension Partnership into Program planning to

ensure that the results of the Program reach small and medium-sized entities.

''(6) DETAILEES.—Any Federal Government employee may be detailed to the National Program Office without reimbursement. Such detail shall be without interruption or loss of civil service status or privilege.

''(g) REPORTING AND AUDITING.—

''(1) ANNUAL REPORTS TO THE SECRETARY.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall require each recipient of financial assistance under subsection (d)(1) to annually submit a report to the Secretary that describes the finances and performance of the center for manufacturing innovation for which such assistance was awarded.

''(B) ELEMENTS.—Each report submitted under subparagraph (A) shall include—

''(i) an accounting of expenditures of amounts awarded to the recipient under subsection (d)(1); and

''(ii) consistent with the metrics-based performance measures developed and implemented by the Secretary under this section, a description of the performance of the center for manufacturing innovation with respect to—

''(I) its goals, plans, financial support, and accomplishments; and

''(II) how the center for manufacturing innovation has furthered the purposes described in subsection (a)(2).

''(2) ANNUAL REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Not less frequently than once each year until December 31, 2024, the Secretary shall submit a report to Congress that describes the performance of the Program during the most recent 1-year period.

''(B) ELEMENTS.—Each report submitted under subparagraph (A) shall include, for the period covered by the report—

''(i) a summary and assessment of the reports received by the Secretary under paragraph (1);

''(ii) an accounting of the funds expended by the Secretary under the Program, including any temporary exemptions granted from the requirements of subsection (d)(5)(C);

''(iii) an assessment of the participation in, and contributions to, the Network by any centers for manufacturing innovation not receiving financial assistance under subsection (d)(1); and

''(iv) an assessment of the Program with respect to meeting the purposes described in subsection (a)(2).

''(3) ASSESSMENTS BY GAO.—

''(A) ASSESSMENTS.—Not less frequently than once every 2 years, the Comptroller General shall submit to Congress an assessment of the operation of the Program during the most recent 2-year period.

''(B) FINAL ASSESSMENT.—Not later than December 31, 2024, the Comptroller General shall submit to Congress a final report regarding the overall success of the Program.

''(C) ELEMENTS.—Each assessment submitted under subparagraph (A) or (B) shall include, for the period covered by the report—

''(i) a review of the management, coordination, and industry utility of the Program;

''(ii) an assessment of the extent to which the Program has furthered the purposes described in subsection (a)(2);

''(iii) such recommendations for legislative and administrative action as the Comptroller General considers appropriate to improve the Program; and

''(iv) an assessment as to whether any prior recommendations for improvement made by the Comptroller General have been implemented or adopted.

''(h) ADDITIONAL AUTHORITIES.—

''(1) APPOINTMENT OF PERSONNEL AND CONTRACTS.—The Secretary may appoint such personnel and enter into such contracts, financial assistance agreements, and other agreements as the Secretary considers necessary or appropriate to carry out the Program, including support for research and development activities involving a center for manufacturing innovation.

''(2) TRANSFER OF FUNDS.—Of amounts available under the authority provided by subsection (e), the Secretary may transfer to other Federal agencies such sums as the Secretary considers necessary or appropriate to carry out the Program. No funds so transferred may be used to reimburse or otherwise pay for the costs of financial assistance incurred or commitments of financial assistance made prior to the date of enactment of the Revitalize American Manufacturing and Innovation Act of 2014.

''(3) AUTHORITY OF OTHER AGENCIES.—In the event that the Secretary exercises the authority to transfer funds to another agency under paragraph (2), such agency may accept such funds to award and administer, under the same conditions and constraints applicable to the Secretary, all aspects of financial assistance awards under this section.

''(4) USE OF RESOURCES.—In furtherance of the purposes of the Program, the Secretary may use, with the consent of a covered entity and with or without reimbursement, the land, services, equipment, personnel, and facilities of such covered entity.

''(5) ACCEPTANCE OF RESOURCES.—In addition to amounts appropriated to carry out the Program, the Secretary may accept funds, services, equipment, personnel, and facilities from any covered entity to carry out the Program, subject to the same conditions and constraints otherwise applicable to the Secretary under this section and such funds may only be obligated to the extent provided for in advance by appropriations Acts.

''(6) COVERED ENTITY.—For purposes of this subsection, a covered entity is any Federal department, Federal agency, instrumentality of the United States, State, local government, tribal government, territory, or possession of the United States, or of any political subdivision thereof, or international organization, or any public or private entity or individual.

''(i) PATENTS.—Chapter 18 of title 35, United States Code, shall apply to any funding agreement (as defined in section 201 of that title) awarded to new or existing centers for manufacturing innovation.''.

SEC. 4. NATIONAL STRATEGIC PLAN FOR ADVANCED MANUFACTURING.

Section 102 of the America COMPETES Reauthorization Act of 2010 (42 U.S.C. 6622) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by adding at the end the following: ''In furtherance of the Committee's work, the Committee shall consult with the National Economic Council.'';

(2) in subsection (b), by striking paragraph (7) and inserting the following:

''(7) develop and update a national strategic plan for advanced manufacturing in accordance with subsection (c).''; and

(3) by striking subsection (c) and inserting the following:

''(c) NATIONAL STRATEGIC PLAN FOR ADVANCED MANUFACTURING.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The President shall submit to Congress, and publish on an Internet website that is accessible to the public, the strategic plan developed under paragraph (2).

''(2) DEVELOPMENT.—The Committee shall develop, and update as required under paragraph (4), in coordination with the National Economic Council, a strategic plan to improve Government coordination and provide long-term guidance for Federal programs and activities in support of United States manufacturing competitiveness, including advanced manufacturing research and development.

''(3) CONTENTS.—The strategic plan described in paragraph (2) shall—

''(A) specify and prioritize near-term and long-term objectives, including research and development objectives, the anticipated time frame for achieving the objectives, and the metrics for use in assessing progress toward the objectives;

''(B) describe the progress made in achieving the objectives from prior strategic plans, including a discussion of why specific objectives were not met;

''(C) specify the role, including the programs and activities, of each relevant Federal agency in meeting the objectives of the strategic plan;

''(D) describe how the Federal agencies and Federally funded research and development centers supporting advanced manufacturing research and development will foster the transfer of research and development results into new manufacturing technologies and United States-based manufacturing of new products and processes for the benefit of society to ensure national, energy, and economic security;

''(E) describe how such Federal agencies and centers will strengthen all levels of manufacturing education and training programs to ensure an adequate, well-trained workforce;

''(F) describe how such Federal agencies and centers will assist small and medium-sized manufacturers in developing and implementing new products and processes;

''(G) analyze factors that impact innovation and competitiveness for United States advanced manufacturing, including—

''(i) technology transfer and commercialization activities;

''(ii) the adequacy of the national security industrial base;

''(iii) the capabilities of the domestic manufacturing workforce;

''(iv) export opportunities and trade policies;

''(v) financing, investment, and taxation policies and practices;

''(vi) emerging technologies and markets;

''(vii) advanced manufacturing research and development undertaken by competing nations; and

''(viii) the capabilities of the manufacturing workforce of competing nations; and

''(H) elicit and consider the recommendations of a wide range of stakeholders, including representatives from diverse manufacturing companies, academia, and other relevant organizations and institutions.

''(4) UPDATES.—Not later than May 1, 2018, and not less frequently than once every 4 years thereafter, the President shall submit to Congress, and publish on an Internet website that is accessible to the public, an update of the strategic plan submitted under paragraph (1). Such updates shall be developed in accordance with the procedures set forth under this subsection.

''(5) REQUIREMENT TO CONSIDER STRATEGY IN THE BUDGET.—In preparing the budget for a fiscal year under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, the President shall include information regarding the consistency of the budget with the goals and recommendations included in the strategic plan developed under this subsection applying to that fiscal year.

''(6) AMP STEERING COMMITTEE INPUT.—The Advanced Manufacturing Partnership Steering Committee of the President's Council of Advisors on Science and Technology shall provide input, perspective, and recommendations to assist in the development and updates of the strategic plan under this subsection.''.

SEC. 5. REGIONAL INNOVATION PROGRAM.

Section 27 of the Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980 (15 U.S.C. 3722) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 27. REGIONAL INNOVATION PROGRAM.

''(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary shall establish a regional innovation program to encourage and support the development of regional innovation strategies, including regional innovation clusters.

''(b) CLUSTER GRANTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—As part of the program established under subsection (a), the Secretary may award grants on a competitive basis to eligible recipients for activities relating to the formation and development of regional innovation clusters.

''(2) PERMISSIBLE ACTIVITIES.—Grants awarded under this subsection may be used for activities determined appropriate by the Secretary, including the following:

''(A) Feasibility studies.

''(B) Planning activities.

''(C) Technical assistance.

''(D) Developing or strengthening communication and collaboration between and among participants of a regional innovation cluster.

''(E) Attracting additional participants to a regional innovation cluster.

''(F) Facilitating market development of products and services developed by a regional innovation cluster, including through demonstration, deployment, technology transfer, and commercialization activities.

''(G) Developing relationships between a regional innovation cluster and entities or clusters in other regions.

''(H) Interacting with the public and State and local governments to meet the goals of the cluster.

''(3) ELIGIBLE RECIPIENT DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term 'eligible recipient' means—

''(A) a State;

''(B) an Indian tribe;

''(C) a city or other political subdivision of a State;

''(D) an entity that—

''(i) is a nonprofit organization, an institution of higher education, a public-private partnership, a science or research park, a Federal laboratory, or an economic development organization or similar entity; and

''(ii) has an application that is supported by a State or a political subdivision of a State; or

''(E) a consortium of any of the entities described in subparagraphs (A) through (D).

''(4) APPLICATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—An eligible recipient shall submit an application to the Secretary at such time, in such manner, and containing such information and assurances as the Secretary may require.

''(B) COMPONENTS.—The application shall include, at a minimum, a description of the regional innovation cluster supported by the proposed activity, including a description of—

''(i) whether the regional innovation cluster is supported by the private sector, State and local governments, and other relevant stakeholders;

''(ii) how the existing participants in the regional innovation cluster will encourage and solicit participation by all types of entities that might benefit from participation, including newly formed entities and those rival existing participants;

''(iii) the extent to which the regional innovation cluster is likely to stimulate innovation and have a positive impact on regional economic growth and development;

''(iv) whether the participants in the regional innovation cluster have access to, or contribute to, a well-trained workforce;

''(v) whether the participants in the regional innovation cluster are capable of attracting additional funds from non-Federal sources; and

''(vi) the likelihood that the participants in the regional innovation cluster will be able to sustain activities once grant funds under this subsection have been expended.

''(C) SPECIAL CONSIDERATION.—The Secretary shall give special consideration to applications from regions that contain communities negatively impacted by trade.

''(5) SPECIAL CONSIDERATION.—The Secretary shall give special consideration to an eligible recipient who agrees to collaborate with local workforce investment area boards.

''(6) COST SHARE.—The Secretary may not provide more than 50 percent of the total cost of any activity funded under this subsection.

''(7) OUTREACH TO RURAL COMMUNITIES.—The Secretary shall conduct outreach to public and private sector entities in rural communities to encourage those entities to participate in regional innovation cluster activities under this subsection.

''(8) FUNDING.—The Secretary may accept funds from other Federal agencies to support grants and activities under this subsection.

''(c) REGIONAL INNOVATION RESEARCH AND INFORMATION PROGRAM.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—As part of the program established under subsection (a), the Secretary shall establish a regional innovation research and information program—

''(A) to gather, analyze, and disseminate information on best practices for regional innovation strategies (including regional innovation clusters), including information relating to how innovation, productivity, and economic development can be maximized through such strategies;

''(B) to provide technical assistance, including through the development of technical assistance guides, for the development and implementation of regional innovation strategies (including regional innovation clusters);

''(C) to support the development of relevant metrics and measurement standards to evaluate regional innovation strategies (including regional innovation clusters), including the extent to which such strategies stimulate innovation, productivity, and economic development; and

''(D) to collect and make available data on regional innovation cluster activity in the United States, including data on—

''(i) the size, specialization, and competitiveness of regional innovation clusters;

''(ii) the regional domestic product contribution, total jobs and earnings by key occupations, establishment size, nature of specialization, patents, Federal research and development spending, and other relevant information for regional innovation clusters; and

''(iii) supply chain product and service flows within and between regional innovation clusters.

''(2) RESEARCH GRANTS.—The Secretary may award research grants on a competitive basis to support and further the goals of the program established under this subsection.

''(3) DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION.—Data and analysis compiled by the Secretary under the program established in this subsection shall be made available to other Federal agencies, State and local governments, and nonprofit and for-profit entities.

''(4) REGIONAL INNOVATION GRANT PROGRAM.—The Secretary shall incorporate data and analysis relating to any grant under subsection (b) into the program established under this subsection.

''(d) INTERAGENCY COORDINATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—To the maximum extent practicable, the Secretary shall ensure that the activities carried out under this section are coordinated with, and do not duplicate the efforts of, other programs at the Department of Commerce or other Federal agencies.

''(2) COLLABORATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall explore and pursue collaboration with other Federal agencies, including through multiagency funding opportunities, on regional innovation strategies.

''(B) SMALL BUSINESSES.—The Secretary shall ensure that such collaboration with Federal agencies prioritizes the needs and challenges of small businesses.

''(e) EVALUATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of the Revitalize American Manufacturing and Innovation Act of 2014, the Secretary shall enter into a contract with an independent entity, such as the National Academy of Sciences, to conduct an evaluation of the program established under subsection (a).

''(2) REQUIREMENTS.—The evaluation shall include—

''(A) whether the program is achieving its goals;

''(B) any recommendations for how the program may be improved; and

''(C) a recommendation as to whether the program should be continued or terminated.

''(f) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) REGIONAL INNOVATION CLUSTER.—The term 'regional innovation cluster' means a geographically bounded network of similar, synergistic, or complementary entities that—

''(A) are engaged in or with a particular industry sector and its related sectors;

''(B) have active channels for business transactions and communication;

''(C) share specialized infrastructure, labor markets, and services; and

''(D) leverage the region's unique competitive strengths to stimulate innovation and create jobs.

''(2) STATE.—The term 'State' means one of the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, or any other territory or possession of the United States.

''(g) FUNDING.—

''(1) GENERAL RULE.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), no funds are authorized to be appropriated by the Revitalize American Manufacturing and Innovation Act of 2014 for carrying out this section.

''(2) AUTHORITY.—To the extent provided for in advance by appropriations Acts, the Secretary may use not to exceed $10,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2015 through 2019 to carry out this section from amounts appropriated for economic development assistance programs.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUCSHON) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BUCSHON. 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 H.R. 2996, the bill now under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

H.R. 2996, the Revitalize American Manufacturing and Innovation Act of 2014, or RAMI Act, strengthens a critical sector of America's economy: advanced manufacturing.

Thanks to Congressman TOM REED from New York for his diligent work on this legislation and to the gentleman from Massachusetts, JOE KENNEDY. I also want to acknowledge the leadership of Science Committee Chairman LAMAR SMITH who worked with Mr. REED and Mr. KENNEDY and members on both sides of the aisle on our committee in order to reach a bipartisan consensus on this legislation.

A strong manufacturing base is fundamental to U.S. economic success and national security.

Manufacturing supports more than 17 million direct and indirect American jobs. This includes 12 million Americans—almost 10 percent of the workforce—who work directly for small, medium, or large manufacturing companies.

For the millions of Americans who are employed in manufacturing fields, what matters most is that the manufacturing creates good-paying, family-supporting, community-sustaining jobs.

Manufacturing is especially important to Indiana, as it makes up just over 28 percent of our gross State product, the highest in the country. Indiana also leads the Nation in manufacturing employment. In Indiana's Eighth Congressional District that I represent, I have seen firsthand the work being done at manufacturers such as Berry Plastics, Toyota Motor, and Alcoa.

The thriving manufacturing industry in the Eighth District is also thanks to universities like Vincennes University, the University of Evansville, and the University of Southern Indiana producing a talented and well-trained workforce through degrees related to advanced manufacturing and working closely with the manufacturing employers in the district. Ivy Tech statewide also supports this effort.

My district is also home to every coal mine in Indiana. Affordable energy from sources such as coal and natural gas are vital components in boosting production for American manufacturers and attracting others from across the globe.

The United States continues to have one of the largest, strongest manufacturing sectors in the world and has demonstrated its ability to adapt and innovate time and time again. But our leading position is not guaranteed. Competing nations have been ramping up their investments in research and development and taking decisive steps to equal and surpass the United States. For instance, the World Bank reports that China already has forged ahead in high technology exports, with about 28 percent of the global market, compared to 18 percent for the United States.

We need to take steps now to emphasize the strengths of American industry and shore up its weaknesses. With a limited government role, we can help our manufacturers to be competitive and ensure that American workers and their families reap the benefits of high-paying advanced manufacturing jobs.

This bill will help our advanced manufacturers to accelerate the pace at which new technology is converted into better manufacturing processes and improved products.

This legislation will help America remain globally competitive in manufacturing. It will ensure that new and innovative projects come equipped with ''Made in America'' on their labels.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin by thanking my colleague and friend, TOM REED, for being a partner as we built momentum and support for this bill from the very beginning.

I would also like to thank the chairman of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee, Chairman LAMAR SMITH, and Ranking Member EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON for their leadership as we worked out this bill through our committee.

By many metrics the economic picture in this country continues to improve. Unemployment rates are down, businesses are growing, and innovation is occurring at a breathtaking pace. But there is a flip side to that coin that we cannot ignore: our economic recovery to date has left far too many behind.

In my district, proud industrial cities like Fall River, Taunton, and Attleboro are working tirelessly in the face of stubborn unemployment rates to adapt their workforce, infrastructure, and industry to the realities of a modern, global economy.

Our manufacturing sector is a critical vehicle for bringing industrial cities and working-class communities across the country into the fold of the innovation economy, providing a critical link between our middle class workforce and fast-growing fields like biotech, robotics, or clean energy.

The resurgence in American manufacturing has already reaped enormous economic gains, currently supporting over 17 million jobs with an average annual salary of over $77,500.

There is a lot more potential on that table, and that is the idea behind RAMI. This bill creates a National Network for Manufacturing Innovation to improve our competitiveness, stimulate R&D, spread the risk of investment to bring new products and ideas to market, educate the next-generation workforce, and facilitate peer-to-peer exchange and best practices.

These public-private centers for manufacturing innovation will leverage limited and targeted government funding matched dollar for dollar with private sector investment and expertise.

Each center will be based on a new technology.

Partnerships will include large and small businesses, universities, community colleges, career and technical schools, Federal labs, and nonprofits.

Centers will leverage the regional assets to overcome communal challenges.

Groups will apply for funding, putting the reins back where they belong: in the hands of industry and researchers facing the next big manufacturing challenge.

Each application will go through an open, transparent peer and merit review process, minimizing conflicts of interest and ensuring the best practices and best proposals move forward.

It is a model that we have already seen proven successful across the country, where institutes are creating jobs and bringing products to market in diverse fields such as 3D printing, clean energy, semiconductors, and digital design.

I urge my colleagues to help propel this growth by supporting the Revitalize American Manufacturing and Innovation Act.

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

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. REED), the sponsor of the bill.

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding time for me to address you this evening.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of this Revitalize American Manufacturing and Innovation Act that we have authored and submitted for consideration today.

But as we speak about the details and before we speak about the details, I want to take a moment to thank a few people. I would like to thank my good friend from Massachusetts. JOE KENNEDY and I started on this effort many months ago. We went through the process, and we are here tonight after lengthy negotiations, deliberations, and input from many stakeholders from all across America. With his diligent hard work standing with us, I am proud to call him a friend this evening as we consider this legislation for passage.

I would like to thank Chairman SMITH of the Science Committee for standing firm and leading on this issue, as well, as well as the subcommittee chairman, my good friend from Indiana (Mr. BUCSHON), as well as the ranking members, JOHNSON and LIPINSKI, of the Science Committee and the Appropriations Committee, and Chairman HAL ROGERS.

Mr. Speaker, I am excited about this legislation. When I came here to Washington, D.C., in 2010, I came here to do something. This is the kind of legislation—bringing parties together, Democrats, Republicans standing together in a concerted, directed effort—to get policy adopted that will grow the American economy and put people back to work.

We hear the term many times, and heard it tonight again: jobs. Well, Mr.

Speaker, this legislation will accomplish that. But on top of that, this legislation is designed to the heart of advanced manufacturing in the United States of America. These are the great innovations of tomorrow that we are taking from the concept phase and putting into the commercial phase.

And how are we doing that? With a united vision, a united plan, Democrats, Republicans, coming together to stand for workforce development, for identifying those technologies that are emerging that we can put as a priority on the national stage to create the jobs of today and tomorrow, because at the end of the day that is what this is all about. This is about building it here to sell it there. It is about building those products that generations before us envisioned but just couldn't get to the finish line. This is a concerted effort that will take that technology innovation from the shelf and put it in Main Street America so that hardworking taxpayers will have an opportunity for this generation and the generations to come.

I applaud this legislation, I applaud this effort. As we do this, let us recognize that we came together to pay for this legislation tonight, fully offset, the program and priority that we are putting together through this RAMI legislation.

Now, I look forward to the Senate and their efforts to hopefully take this legislation up. Things I hear today and tonight are very positive on that front. I encourage my colleagues in the Senate to act quickly to create and pass this legislation that will provide for generations to come.

We have created an opportunity here to create American jobs. It is time for us, as we did many times before, to come together, solve America's problems, and put this type of legislation on the President's desk—which all indications are that he will accept and sign—and get American manufacturing back on its feet so that it builds products for generations to come.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON).

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2996, the Revitalize American Manufacturing and Innovation Act of 2014.

When it comes to job-creating bills, many of our promises these days can seem empty. But the bill before us today will deliver results, not just rhetoric. This bill, if enacted and funded, will do more than any other measure this Congress has recently debated to revitalize American manufacturing and create high-skill, high-paying jobs in communities across the country.

The decline in U.S. manufacturing has been a threat to middle class jobs and to our entire economy for decades. Many of those jobs, however, were low-skilled jobs, never to return. But we have also seen a large number of higher-skilled jobs move offshore, along with the supply chain that supports manufacturing.

The good news is we experience a rebound in good-paying, high-skilled jobs as our economy continues to recover and manufacturers realize the advantages of remaining close to the world's greatest scientific and technological talent.

□ 2130

However, these gains remain modest. In the meantime, our international competitors are busy implementing and funding policies that will further threaten the American manufacturing base and send our best talents overseas.

I am deeply concerned that we could reach a tipping point beyond which it will be nearly impossible to rebuild a vibrant manufacturing sector here in the U.S. We must act now to ensure that American companies and factories maintain their capacity to be the most sophisticated in the world and that American colleges and universities graduate the workforce to fill advanced manufacturing jobs on our shores.

The Revitalize American Manufacturing Innovation Act, or RAMI, is a critical step toward this goal. This bill makes strategic investments in advanced manufacturing research, development, and education across our Nation. In keeping with our entire history of innovation, this bill creates partnerships involving the public sector, the private sector, and our great research institutions for the benefit of Americans.

However, even if this bill gets enacted this month, our job is not done. Specifically, I am concerned about an unnecessary obstacle we have added to the bill that could make it difficult to stand up and sustain this program. To meet majority rules about offsetting all new authorizations, the bill that passed out of committee contained language that by some subsequent interpretations looked like appropriating on an authorization bill. I want to assure my appropriations colleagues that if I had my way, we would have written a straightforward authorization as we have always done throughout this committee's history.

Clarifying language has been added to the bill, but we now look to the appropriators to take the next step necessary of standing up for this program in fiscal year 2015. In that regard, I look forward to working with my appropriations colleagues to ensure that this program gets funded next year and for the duration of the authorization.

I would like to thank my colleagues, Mr. KENNEDY and Mr. REED, for their bipartisan work to develop this legislation and determination in moving it forward. I would also like to thank Chairman SMITH for his efforts to bring this bill to the floor.

Finally, I am also pleased that this legislation includes the manufacturing strategy introduced by Mr. LIPINSKI and the reauthorization of the Regional Innovation program introduced by Mr. HULTGREN and Mr. KILMER. These are important steps in the right direction.

I strongly support this legislation, and I urge all of my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH), the chairman of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, first of all, let me say to the gentleman from New York (Mr. REED) and to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) that I appreciate all their time, effort, and work that has gone into this piece of legislation. It is because of their patience and diligence and persistence that we arrived at this particularly important place tonight and are considering this legislation.

I also wanted to point out that this bill will, with every expectation that we have, create thousands of manufacturing jobs in the United States. The fact that New York and Massachusetts will benefit from these jobs is an important consideration, but the jobs that are created are going to be across the country. And so the gentlemen from New York and Massachusetts are doing an immense favor to our economy and to our economic growth in America.

Mr. Speaker, advanced manufacturing is fundamental to future U.S. economic success and national security. America has led the world since World War II, but our global leadership is not guaranteed. Competing nations have increased their investments in advanced manufacturing to surpass the United States. The World Bank reports, for example, that China now leads the U.S. in high-tech exports with 28 percent of the global market versus 18 percent for the United States.

In order to be competitive, our advanced manufacturers, large, medium, and small, must accelerate R&D, develop next generation products, develop new manufacturing processes, retrain their workforce, and introduce new technology to supply chains.

This legislation, the Revitalize American Innovation Act of 2014, by Representatives REED and KENNEDY authorizes up to $300 million for fiscal years 2015 through 2024 for the Commerce Department, NIST, to develop the Network for Manufacturing Innovation, or NMI.

The NMI will not increase spending because $250 million will come from annual appropriations from the Department of Energy's Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy and $50 million from annual appropriations for Industrial Technical Services. NMI will accelerate private investment, commercialization of technology, and cooperation among multiple industrial entities, research universities, and other stakeholders to increase competitiveness and innovation in U.S. advanced manufacturing.

Also included in the legislation is a bill developed by Mr. LIPINSKI which requires the President to submit a quadrennial advanced manufacturing strategic plan to Congress, a comprehensive assessment of the global competitive situation, and recommendations for strengthening the competitiveness of U.S. advanced manufacturing.

In the latter category, for instance, three obvious steps stand out right now. Two of these steps are highlighted by the just-released 2014 International Tax Competitiveness Index, which ranks the overall U.S. tax system as 32nd worst among the 34 developed nations. We would go a long way toward reinvigorating our economy and putting Americans back to work if we first reduce the U.S. corporate tax rate from highest in the developed world, and second, encourage more business investment in new technology by making the R&D tax credit permanent.

The third crucial step to bolster U.S. manufacturing is to recognize the importance and take advantage of abundant, affordable domestic natural gas. Shale gas is a major revolution contributing to the manufacturing renaissance taking place in America.

Manufacturing accounts for 30 percent of natural gas consumption in the U.S. and represents more than one-third of some manufacturers' costs. Not only does affordable, abundant natural gas benefit our entire manufacturing sector, the coproducts of natural gas are primary feedstocks for the production of chemicals, fertilizers, and plastics.

An industry expert recently reported that U.S. chemical manufacturers have surpassed $100 billion in investments related to shale gas, with an anticipated $81 billion in new annual chemical industry output and more than 600,000 permanent new jobs in the U.S. In Texas alone, there have been nearly 30 projects announced in the petrochemical manufacturing sector.

Finally, included in the bill before us is a provision authored by Mr. HULTGREN and cosponsored by Mr. KILMER to support regional innovation efforts to make U.S. manufacturers and businesses more competitive. Funding for this 5-year program will come from annual appropriations for the Commerce Department's economic development programs.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I want to acknowledge the bipartisan cooperation that has gone into moving this legislation through the Science Committee and to the House floor. To all of my colleagues on the committee, to the Research and Technology Subcommittee chair and ranking member, Mr. BUCSHON and Mr. LIPINSKI, and to the ranking member of the Science Committee, Ms. JOHNSON, the gentlewoman from Texas, thank you for your good work that has brought us to the point of passage of the bill.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

Mr. CICILLINE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Revitalize American Manufacturing and Innovation Act of 2014.

Rhode Island, the birthplace of the industrial revolution, with a very strong and long manufacturing history, is seeing the benefits of investing in rebuilding manufacturing, and this bill will create exciting opportunities to do more.

This important legislation will establish the Network for Manufacturing Innovation program and a grant program to support domestic production, drive innovation, and leverage private funding and commercialization to develop sustainable business strategies.

Across the United States, industry experts and economists are increasingly optimistic about a resurgence in American manufacturing. This is a critical time for Congress to help Federal, State, and local entities leverage existing resources, spur regional collaboration, and support economic recovery and job creation in high-growth advanced manufacturing sectors.

In particular, I want to thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. REED), the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), and the entire committee for the inclusion of a provision to reauthorize the Regional Innovation program for 5 years. I particularly want to compliment both of my colleagues Mr. REED and Mr. KENNEDY for their work on this bill and for approaching this important issue with a spirit of real bipartisanship and genuine collaboration.

In an effort to promote innovation and regional collaboration, the America COMPETES Reauthorization Act of 2010 established a Regional Innovation program within the Economic Development Administration. The program is designed to encourage and support the development of regional innovation strategies, including regional innovation clusters and science and research parks. Funding for the Regional Innovation program supports the EDA's interagency effort to build regional innovation clusters such as the Jobs and Innovation Accelerator Challenge and the Make it in America Challenge.

Through the Regional Innovation program local leaders are empowered to maximize existing assets and are provided resources to ensure that historically underrepresented communities, including those hardest hit by employment and economic decline, are able to participate and benefit from growth in a regional cluster.

To close, this bill recognizes that manufacturing and innovation are critically important to America's ability to compete in a 21st century global economy. To compete in the 21st century and win, America must invest in scaling up promising technology and innovative ideas. Supporting the development of regional innovation clusters strengthens our capacity to sustain and grow our economic recovery. This legislation will help do just that.

Again, I want to urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I compliment my friends Mr. KENNEDY and Mr. REED for their great work.

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to recognize the ranking member of the Research and Technology Subcommittee. Mr. LIPINSKI has worked on this issue for many years, including the Manufacturing Competitiveness Act that is included in this bill.

At this time, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN), a member of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee, who is another sponsor of the bill.

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my good friend, Mr. BUCSHON from Indiana. I also want to recognize the important leadership of Chairman SMITH. I want to thank him for his great work on this. I also want to thank the sponsors who really did so much of the heavy lifting on this. Congressman REED and Congressman KENNEDY did great work on a wonderful bill.

Manufacturing is a vital component of my district's economy. There are 554 manufacturing facilities in the 14th Congressional District with 10 or more employees in them. Manufacturing facilities employ also more than 27,000 workers across my district alone.

The workers at manufacturing facilities in the 14th Congressional District of Illinois have felt the economic downturn disproportionately as Federal and State governments have failed to change outdated or unneeded policies that keep my constituents from regaining full employment. Later this week, the House will vote on a package of bills to help alleviate these problems, but there are more ways we must act to help ensure our manufacturers have the tools they need to remain competitive on the world stage.

This legislation gives needed direction to the administration for funding a national network for manufacturing innovation. These programs would bring together our country's vast research capabilities and help align our institutions with industry partners. Our universities and colleges must know what industry needs in order to provide valuable research as well as train our next workforce. This legislation would also help to remove some of the barriers that keep industry from working together and innovating in a 21st century economy.

I am also very glad to see authorization for the Regional Innovation program. This is a smart, targeted program that allows local regions to pool their resources and work together. Industry clusters are one of the most effective ways to compile and share best practices, and the fact that these programs give preference to bids involving Local Workforce Investment Boards is another reason to support this bill.

These boards are doing all they can to help my constituents find work, and this is the cooperative federalism that will ensure taxpayer dollars are not wasted.

I would like to commend the gentleman from New York for introducing this legislation, and I urge all of my colleagues to vote in favor of this bill.

□ 2145

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. KILMER).

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Representatives KENNEDY and REED for working across the aisle to develop legislation that will encourage the growth of innovative technologies and the creation of a manufacturing workforce that will be able to compete on the global playing field.

I also want to thank the Representatives for working with Representative HULTGREN and myself to include the reauthorization of the Regional Innovation program.

The Regional Innovation program provides needed support to innovative initiatives that accelerate technology commercialization, job creation, and economic growth in the United States. It acknowledges something important, that innovation and job growth don't happen in large marble buildings in our Nation's Capitol; rather, it happens on the ground in communities throughout our Nation.

It happens in Tacoma where world-class research on clean water is happening in a collaboration between our companies and our university. It is happening on the Olympic Peninsula of Washington where innovative companies and innovative people are developing composite technology in partnership with the local college.

If the United States is going to be a global economic competitor in the 21st century, we need to focus on growing a high-skilled workforce in our communities.

I spent a decade working in economic development. We had a sign up on the wall in our office that said, ''We are competing with everyone, everywhere, every day, forever.''

Bills like this will help us compete. It will help us make things here in the United States; and, as the dad of two little girls, I am hopeful it will provide opportunity for future generations to make things here in America.

I think the Revitalize American Manufacturing and Innovation Bill is a sign we are moving in the right direction.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to quickly address an issue of future appropriations for the network of manufacturing innovation. As recently as the fiscal year 2014 omnibus appropriations act, Congress included language in the explanatory statement, pointing out that the appropriations bill did not address a manufacturing network as Congress had not considered or approved a legislative proposal.

Well, the bill before us today solves that problem. It would authorize agencies to use funds to spur innovation and boost domestic manufacturing.

Even more recently, the fiscal year 2015 Commerce, Justice, Science Appropriations Bill that passed the House on May 30, 2014, included report language on this topic showing an openness to further funding. Congress had been waiting for this bill to come to the floor to formally authorize this important program.

After we pass this bill, I look forward to working with my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee to provide much-needed funding for the network of manufacturing innovation.

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

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds again to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH), the chairman of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Indiana for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, before we conclude debate on this bill, I just wanted to thank senior staff who have worked long months in developing this legislation and in refining it and getting it to the point where it is bipartisan, and we believe that the prospects for passage in the Senate are good as well.

Now, the senior staff on our side, the majority side, include Chris Wydler, Cliff Shannon, and Katy Crooks; and, if I may be presumptuous to do so, on the minority side, they include Dahlia Sokolov and John Piazza. We appreciate their support and many other members of the staff who have contributed to this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time I have left?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. HONDA).

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, as a cosponsor of this bill, I rise in enthusiastic support of H.R. 2996, the Revitalize American Manufacturing and Innovation Act. The public-private partnerships created by this bill will help rebuild our Nation's manufacturing capacity and grow private sector investments in manufacturing.

I hail from Silicon Valley, the Nation's epicenter of technology and innovation. Right now, Silicon Valley is experiencing a manufacturing resurgence. Companies see the benefit of locating their manufacturing in areas with R&D and a high-tech workforce. Nearly 18 percent of Silicon Valley jobs are in manufacturing, and these advanced manufacturing jobs are high paying.

This bill will replicate some of the important qualities of Silicon Valley across this Nation. It will build partnerships between government, academia, and industry to address targeted manufacturing challenges.

I applauded President Obama when he first proposed a network of manufacturing innovation institutes, and I thank the cochairs of the Manufacturing Caucus, Mr. REED and Mr. KENNEDY, for authoring this legislation to authorize such a network.

I have worked with my Silicon Valley constituents to help build strong bipartisan backing of this bill, and I am glad we are on the floor considering it tonight. Hopefully, once this bill is enacted, we can win one of these hubs for Silicon Valley to focus on important challenges like developing the next generation of semiconductor manufacturing tools.

This bill is an important step for countering the incentives that other countries are offering American innovators and manufacturers to relocate overseas. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2996 because it will help revitalize American manufacturing. It is a game-changer.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, with cosponsors and supporters in every corner of the country and each side of the aisle, we must pass this bill and move forward with a national manufacturing policy.

We are here today as part of a process that involved many, many people. Last month, we held a markup in the full Science Committee, adopting several amendments and addressing concerns from members on both sides of the aisle.

Most importantly, Mr. Speaker, this bill represents how Congress is designed to work, ideas from across the country coming together in open, honest discussion to formulate policy that will move our country forward.

I would like to mention the significant staff work of the House leadership offices and the Science Committee for their tireless efforts for bringing us to this point and echo some of the names that Chairman SMITH already mentioned.

From the Science majority, if I may, Jamie Brown, Cliff Shannon, Kirsten Duncan, Chris Shank, Chris Weigel. From the minority staff, Dick Obermann, Dahlia Sokolov, Marcy Gallo, Kim Montgomery, John Piazza. From Congressman REED's office, former staffer Laura Ringdahl and Drew Wayne. From Senator BROWN's office, Chris Slevin and Nora Todd. From Senator BLUNT's office, John Smedile and Tracy Henke. And from the National Institute of Standards and Technology, Jim Schufreider.

Mr. Speaker, through the revitalization of our manufacturing industry, we can provide access to a modern economy for millions of Americans. Our

manufacturing industries these days make far more than just the cheapest widget and Cheetos.

By supporting partnerships between the private sector, government, and academia, we can capitalize on the opportunity offered through growing industry such as life sciences, biotech, precision manufacturing, and many, many others.

I urge my colleagues to vote in support of this bill.

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

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Speaker, a strong manufacturing base is fundamental to U.S. economic success and national security. Again, manufacturing supports millions of good-paying American jobs; and, for the millions of Americans who are employed in the manufacturing field, that is what matters most, good-paying, family-supporting, community-sustaining jobs.

I urge my colleagues all to support this legislation.

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

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 2996, the Revitalize American Manufacturing and Innovation Act, a bipartisan bill to boost American manufacturing, of which I am a cosponsor and original supporter.

Not only do I support the intent of H.R. 2996, which would establish a Network of Manufacturing Innovation and enable public-private partnerships through Centers for Manufacturing Innovation, but it also includes the text of a bill I introduced, the American Manufacturing Competitiveness Act, H.R. 2447.

I believe that both measures are necessary to the continuing revitalization of manufacturing in the United States, and I'm pleased to see the House considering them today. Manufacturing is a linchpin of our Nation's economy. It provides the American middle class with a source of quality jobs making everything from the goods we rely on for everyday needs, to the equipment that we need for national security.

But in the first decade of the century, American manufacturing took a hard hit. Almost one-third of American manufacturing jobs disappeared. After over 110 years as the world's top manufacturing Nation, America got knocked off its perch by China.

I have seen the devastation in my district and across northeastern Illinois. And I get frustrated, just like countless other Americans do, when I go to the store and I cannot find the words ''made in the U.S.A.'' on any product.

The Revitalize American Manufacturing and Innovation Act would authorize a network of centers for manufacturing innovation, based upon the concept of the National Network of Manufacturing Innovation (NNMI) proposed the Administration. I have been a strong supporter of the NNMI proposal from the outset, and am pleased Congress is taking action to authorize these centers.

In fact, just a few months ago I was pleased to join in the announcement of the Digital Manufacturing and Design Innovation Institute in Chicago. This public-private initiative, hosted by the University of Illinois offshoot UI Labs, has leveraged a $70 million federal investment to achieve a commitment of $250 million from industry, academia, government and community partners that will harness expertise and facilities to improve manufacturing processes and innovation and design capabilities to a wide range of stakeholders. One of the greatest attributes of these institutes will be the openness of the system, allowing small- and medium-sized enterprises the opportunity to use novel and often capital-intensive capabilities, such as 3D printing and high-performance computing, to improve their product lines, develop new innovations and make their factories more efficient.

Moreso, I believe that the deployment of these centers of manufacturing innovation will help improve the competitiveness of manufacturing across the nation. Using these high-tech facilities will help attract more students to manufacturing and STEM careers, enable a greater range of research and development on manufacturing processes and products, and improve commercialization opportunities for firms small and large. Other competing nations are making their own serious investments in next-generation institutions and facilities in support of their domestic industries, and it makes competitive sense for the U.S. to leverage our capabilities, in concert with private and other public entities, to make similar investments.

In addition and of particular note to me is Section 4 of this Act, which includes the text of a bill I had introduced, the American Manufacturing Competitiveness Act. This legislation would establish a public-private process for assessing the current competitive state of manufacturing in the United States, compare this against the policies and status of manufacturing in competing nations, and propose measures for the government and stakeholders to take in order to promote manufacturing in the U.S. Based on the Quadrennial Defense Review, the Pentagon's policy planning process, the bill proposes that a group of manufacturing experts from the private and the public sectors would be convened every four years to reassess the progress of American manufacturing, and make new recommendations.

While I agree that manufacturing is by-and-large a private, market endeavor, few can disagree that manufacturing intersects with government policy in countless ways. From tax and trade, to regulation, to research, education, and workforce development, government policies have a significant effect on our manufacturers. It is essential that the U.S. join many of its competing nations in assessing these policies in a comprehensive fashion, rather than a silo-ed, piecemeal approach.

That is why we need a comprehensive, coordinated strategy promoting American manufacturing. While many other countries—China, India, Germany, to name a few—have developed and implemented manufacturing strategies, the United States manufacturing policy is uncoordinated and largely ad hoc. If we want American manufacturing to compete and succeed in a global economy, it is vital that we develop a strategy to coordinate our policies that impact manufacturers. And that is exactly what this bill does.

After a couple of tough decades, I still have a number of small- and medium-size manufacturers in my district in northeastern Illinois. One of these is Atlas Tool & Die of Lyons, Illinois, a 94-year-old family-owned business. The director of development for the company, Zach Mottl, said this about this legislation:

> As a business owner, I know planning is critical. When an organization doesn't operate with a plan, what occurs is a plan to fail. Right now, the United States is operating without a manufacturing strategy in a world where other countries are intensely focused on helping their manufacturers to compete. The American Manufacturing Competitiveness Act will bring all sides and stakeholders together to forge a strategy with broad support and the momentum needed to produce action?

I share Zach's view that we need an overarching plan, and I believe that that the American Manufacturing Competitiveness Act will achieve that. This bill has garnered the endorsement of a wide range of industry, labor and manufacturing organizations, indicating to me that they share our view that a national manufacturing strategy will be essential to moving American manufacturing competitiveness forward.

I would like to thank the numerous colleagues who have helped shepherd my manufacturing strategy legislation along the way, helping it to pass by overwhelming margins in the House during two prior sessions. I appreciate the leadership of Congressmen REED and KENNEDY in introducing this bill, and I'm pleased to have worked with them on it. Congressman ADAM KINZINGER has been a great partner in introducing the manufacturing strategy legislation, while Chairman LAMAR SMITH and Ranking Member JOHNSON were crucial to this bill moving through the Science, Space and Technology Committee.

I am hopeful that we'll be able to achieve House and Senate passage of H.R. 2996 before the end of this year, so that the Network of Manufacturing Innovation and the manufacturing strategy process will soon become reality. I strongly believe both will lead to greater success of manufacturing in America, and with it, a better outlook for our nation's middle class.

I thank my colleagues for the time and opportunity to speak on this important legislation, and urge Members to support the passage of H.R. 2996.

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in enthusiastic support of H.R. 2996, the Revitalize American Manufacturing and Innovation Act. As a proud cosponsor of this bill, I am pleased that the House is considering it today.

The Revitalize American Manufacturing and Innovation Act (RAMI) will help rebuild our nation's manufacturing capacity by creating public-private partnerships that will foster an environment in which the private sector is willing to invest in the strengths of our nation and American manufacturing will grow.

I applauded President Obama when he first proposed the creation of a National Network for Manufacturing Innovation to improve the competitiveness of U.S. manufacturing, stimulate research and development, and increase domestic production. I supported his call for additional centers beyond those he initially proposed, worked in the Appropriations Committee to find funding for some centers, and have suggested to the President that at least one institute should be located in my Silicon Valley district.

Silicon Valley is known as the epicenter of technology and innovation in the United States. What is not as widely recognized is the extent to which Silicon Valley is also experiencing a manufacturing resurgence. Nearly

18 percent of Silicon Valley's jobs are in manufacturing, and that number is growing—the local manufacturing sector is projected to grow by 5 percent by 2018. These advanced manufacturing jobs are offering higher pay than nonmanufacturing jobs. By being co-located with the research and development Silicon Valley is known for, these manufacturers are both boosting R&D investments and experiencing the benefits of more control of their manufacturing processes, quicker turnaround from research to product realization, higher quality, and greater intellectual property security.

The Revitalize American Manufacturing and Innovation Act seeks to replicate some of the important lessons from Silicon Valley around the nation. RAMI will build public-private partnerships through Centers for Manufacturing Innovation between higher education institutions and community colleges, small and large manufacturers, and government to promote best practices and address targeted advanced manufacturing challenges. These advanced manufacturing hubs will also address the skills gap by producing a next generation talent pool of skilled production workers and engineers by focusing on education, workforce training, research and development, and commercialization.

Despite its manufacturing successes, Silicon Valley still continues to experience higher than average unemployment, partly a result of the past outsourcing of manufacturing jobs due to low wages overseas and incentives offered by foreign competitors. With the passage of the RAMI Act, we can we look forward to hosting an advanced manufacturing hub, potentially focused on enabling the transition to the next-generation 450 mm silicon wafer semiconductor manufacturing tools, which would enable Silicon Valley to take advantage of its R&D excellence and bolster its manufacturing sector in new ways, helping us to recover some of those jobs lost to past outsourcing.

Over the past few years, I've been proud to work with House Manufacturing Caucus Co-chairs Reps. TOM REED and JOE KENNEDY on this authorization effort, along with Silicon Valley tech leaders and university stakeholders. I appreciate the willingness of some of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle who were key to building bipartisan support for this effort, particularly my Chairman on the Commerce, Justice, Science Appropriations Subcommittee FRANK WOLF, to talk with us about this legislation and to join as cosponsors of this important bill.

Our competitors around the world are offering American innovators and manufacturers a wide range of incentives to relocate overseas. The RAMI Act will ensure that American innovation and technology development remain at the top of the manufacturing sector, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUCSHON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2996, 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.

THE HOUSE PASSED JOBS BILLS, BUT THE SENATE FAILED TO ACT

(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, over the past 2 years, the House of Representatives has advanced bill after bill to grow our economy.

The House has passed legislation to keep our small businesses growing through smarter regulations. We have passed legislation to increase wages and expand job opportunities. The Senate has failed to act.

The House has passed legislation to make energy more affordable for American families and to keep the country on a path to energy security. The Senate has failed to act.

The House has passed legislation to require the U.S. Forest Service to increase timber production on national forest lands and better manage those national treasures.

We have also advanced legislation to modernize the Endangered Species Act, promoting science-based decision-making and improving species recovery while protecting our economy. The Senate has failed to act.

The House has passed a series of reforms to improve the President's health care law, including a repeal of the harmful 2.3 percent medical device tax. The Senate has failed to act.

The American people deserve better, Mr. Speaker.

THE COALITION OF THE UNWILLING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized until 10 p.m. as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, the President had made a speech last Thursday night, and it is amazing that he is ready to go after ISIS or ISIL and that the Islamic State is not Islamic as they say they are.

It is amazing because, from what I have seen in the beheadings, those who were doing the beheadings always think that they are being religious; so, apparently, the President and his advisers are the only ones that think otherwise because they certainly believe it is a religion.

I wanted to hit some key facts very quickly here. President Obama talks about this great coalition. After all those criticisms of President George W. Bush and the 48 countries or so that actually did participate in the war in Iraq, President Obama's coalition of the unwilling is a better way to talk about his coalition.

NATO ally Turkey announced last week they will not allow the U.S. to conduct air strikes against ISIS from Turkish air bases. So much for their real cooperation.

Germany said it is not going to join U.S. air strikes against ISIS. The United Kingdom has their Foreign Minister announce they will not join air strikes only to be later contradicted by Prime Minister Cameron.

Ten Arab countries signed a communique last week in Jeddah agreeing to qualified cooperation with the U.S. but without any specifics. The State Department claims the Arab nations will conduct air strikes against ISIS but refuses to identify which Arab nations will participate.

Top Islamic cleric Yusuf al-Qaradawi has criticized U.S. attacks on ISIS, and the Syrian Muslim Brotherhood refuses to back any U.S. anti-ISIS efforts because it might circumvent Islamist-dominated structures of the Syrian National Council.

It is also important to note that this administration has admitted they are using back channels to cooperate with Iran. Gee, that would have been like, say, maybe Roosevelt saying we are working with Hitler because Japan attacked us when they all want to kill us.

Vetted moderates are losing U.S. weapons. It is important that people know, September 2013, The Wall Street Journal reported that ISIS raided a Free Syrian Army weapons depot taking small arms ammunition that the CIA provided.

In December 2013, the Free Syrian Army weapon warehouses in Bab al-Hawa—that is near the Syria-Turkey border—was seized by the Islamic Front, prompting the U.S. and the U.K. to stop weapons shipments to the FSA.

In April, the Syrian rebel groups began using heavy weapons including TOW antitank missiles provided by the United States. It is a good thing our southern border is not porous, or they might be bringing them to our border.

June of 2014, the Syrian Military Council official expresses concern that the U.S. is providing weapons directly to the FSA, potentially creating Afghan-Somali-style warlords.

September, we see more reports.

For heaven's sake, Mr. Speaker, this is no time to be helping people who want to cooperate with ISIS to help us take out ISIS. We need better than that.

I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mrs. CAPITO (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today on account of a death in the family.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today on account of official business.

Ms. BROWN of Florida (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of prior commitment in district.

Ms. JACKSON LEE (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of official business in the district.

Mr. LOWENTHAL (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

Ms. MOORE (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

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

H.J. Res. 120. Joint resolution approving the location of a memorial to commemorate the more than 5,000 slaves and free Black persons who fought for independence in the American Revolution.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, September 16, 2014, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

7065. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Irish Potatoes Grown in Certain Designated Counties in Idaho, and Malheur County, Oregon; Modification of Container Requirements [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-14-0046; FV14-945-2 IR] received August 22, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7066. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Russian Oil Industry Sanctions and Addition of Person to the Entity List [Docket No.: 140729634-4638-01] (RIN: 0694-AG25) received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

7067. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Wyoming; Revisions to the Wyoming Air Quality Standards and Regulations; Ambient Standards for Particulate Matter and for Lead [EPA-R08-OAR-2013-0006; FRL-9915-75-Region 8] received August 25, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7068. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Methoxyfenozide; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2013-0476; FRL-9913-99] received August 25, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7069. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, Imperial County Air Pollution Control District And Shasta County Air Quality Management District [EPA-R09-OAR-2014-0417; FRL-9913-13-Region 9] received August 25, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7070. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Department's final rule — Schedules of Controlled Substances: Rescheduling of Hydrocodone Combination Products From Schedule III to Schedule II [Docket No.: DEA-389] received August 25, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7071. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Maintenance Rule [NRC-2013-0179] received August 18, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7072. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Northeast Multispecies Fishery; Trimester Total Allowable Catch Area Closure for the Common Pool Fishery and Possession Limit Adjustment [Docket No.: 140106011-4338-02] (RIN: 0648-XD418) received August 22, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

7073. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries Off West Coast States; the Highly Migratory Species Fishery; Closure [Docket No.: 031125295-4091-02] (RIN: 0648-XD238) received August 22, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

7074. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Northeast Multispecies Fisheries Management Plan; Northern Red Hake Quota Harvested [Docket No.: 110816505-2184-03] (RIN: 0648-XD336) received August 22, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

7075. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries Off West Coast States; Coastal Pelagic Species Fisheries; Annual Specifications [Docket No.: 140417346-4575-02] (RIN: 0648-XD252) received August 12, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

7076. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Monkfish; Framework Adjustment 8 [Docket No.: 130726661-4551-02] (RIN: 0648-BD56) received August 12, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

7077. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; 2014 Commercial Accountability Measure and Closure for South Atlantic Snowy Grouper [Docket No.: 1206013412-2517-02] (RIN: 0648-XD386) received August 12, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

7078. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator For Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska: Pacific Halibut and Sablefish Individual Fishing Quota Program [Docket No.: 120926497-4576-02] (RIN: 0648-BC62) received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

7079. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulations for Marine Events, Sunset Lake; Wildwood Crest, NJ [Docket Number: USCG-2014-0701] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received August 22, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7080. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulations for Marine Events, Atlantic Ocean; Atlantic City, NJ [Docket Number: USCG-2014-0703] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received August 22, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7081. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulation; Cumberland River, Mile 127.0 to 128.0; Clarksville, TN [Docket Number: USCG-2014-0489] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received August 22, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7082. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulation, U.S. Hydro-Drag Nationals, Lake Dora; Tavares, FL [Docket Number: USCG-2014-0643] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received August 22, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7083. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; TAKE MARU 55 Vessel Salvage; Cocos Island, Merizo, Guam [Docket No.: USCG-2014-0721] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received August 22, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7084. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone, Aquarium Wedding, Delaware River; Camden, NJ [Docket Number: USCG-2014-0704] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received August 22, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7085. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulations for Marine Events, Atlantic Ocean; Ocean City, NJ [Docket Number: USCG-2014-0705] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received August 22, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7086. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulations for Marine Events, New Jersey Intracoastal Waterway; Atlantic City, NJ [Docket Number: USCG-2014-0702] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received August 22, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7087. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone, Labor Day Long Neck Style Fireworks, Indian River Bay; Long Neck, DE [Docket Number: USCG-2014-0696] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received August 22, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7088. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters

(Previously Eurocopter France) [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0515; Directorate Identifier 2014-SW-036-AD; Amendment 39-17921; AD 2014-12-51] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7089. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0253; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-257-AD; Amendment 39-17908; AD 2014-15-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7090. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; MD Helicopters, Inc., Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0514; Directorate Identifier 2014-SW-027-AD; Amendment 39-17925; AD 2014-16-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7091. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Fuji Heavy Industries, Ltd. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0311; Directorate Identifier 2014-CE-014-AD; Amendment 39-17927; AD 2014-16-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7092. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Mooney International Corporation Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0513; Directorate Identifier 2014-CE-020-AD; Amendment 39-17920; AD 2014-15-18] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7093. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Saab AB, Saab Aerosystems Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0056; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-160-AD; Amendment 39-17906; AD 2014-15-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7094. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0790; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-061-AD; Amendment 39-17916; AD 2014-15-14] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7095. A letter from the Assistant Chief Counsel for Hazmat, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Hazardous Materials: Failure to Pay Civil Penalties [Docket No.: PHMSA-2012-0258 (HM-258A)] (RIN: 2137-AE97) received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7096. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Departing IFR/VFR When Weather Reporting Is Not Available [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0502; Amdt. No. 135-131] (RIN: 2120-AK49) received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7097. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30963 Amdt. No. 3595] received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7098. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0268; Directorate Identifier 2011-NM-129-AD; Amendment 39-17914; AD 2014-15-12] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7099. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0145; Directorate Identifier 2011-NM-066-AD; Amendment 39-17899; AD 2014-14-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7100. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D and Class E Airspace; Hartford, CT [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0384; Airspace Docket No. 14-ANE-6] received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7101. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Needles, CA [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0987; Airspace Docket No.: 13-AWP-19] received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7102. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendment [Docket No.: 30964; Amdt. No. 3596] received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7103. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30966; Amdt. No. 3598] received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7104. A letter from the Assistant Chief Counsel for Hazmat, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Hazardous Materials: Transportation of Lithium Batteries [Docket No.: PHMSA-2009-0095 (HM-224F)] (RIN: 2137-AE44) received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7105. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30965; Amdt. No. 3597] received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7106. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Steele, MO [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0154; Airspace Docket No. 14-ACE-1] received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7107. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Truth or Consequences, NM [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0995; Airspace Docket No. 13-ASW-30] received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7108. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Memphis, MO [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0224; Airspace Docket No. 13-ACE-15] received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7109. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Time of Designation for Restricted Area R-3002G; Fort Benning, GA [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0389; Airspace Docket No. 14-ASO-6] (RIN: 2120-AA66), pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7110. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of Class B Airspace; Salt Lake City, UT [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0859; Airspace Docket No. 13-AWA-4] (RIN: 2120-AA66), pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7111. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters Deutschland GmbH (Airbus Helicopter) (Previously Eurocopter Deutschland GmbH) Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0394; Directorate Identifier 2014-SW-015-AD; Amendment 39-17875; AD 2014-13-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7112. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters (Previously Eurocopter France) Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2013-1090; Directorate Identifier 2013-SW-017-AD; Amendment 39-17873; AD 2014-12-12] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7113. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Columbia Helicopters, Inc. (Type Certificate Previously Held By Boeing Defense & Space Group) Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0385; Directorate Identifier 2013-SW-079-AD; Amendment 39-17879; AD 2014-13-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7114. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Dassault Aviation Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0862; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-098-AD; Amendment 39-17863; AD 2014-12-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7115. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Turbomeca S.A. Turboshaft Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2006-23809;

Directorate Identifier 2005-NE-52-AD; Amendment 39-17866; AD 2014-12-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7116. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0488; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-141-AD; Amendment 39-17919; AD 2014-15-17] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7117. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Hawker Beechcraft Corporation Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0187; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-087-AD; Amendment 39-17917; AD 2014-15-15] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7118. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0228; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-216-AD; Amendment 39-17911; AD 2014-15-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7119. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0486; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-126-AD; Amendment 39-17918; AD 2014-15-16] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7120. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0196; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-015-AD; Amendment 39-17913; AD 2014-15-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7121. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Sikorsky Aircraft Corporation Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2009-1088; Directorate Identifier 2008-SW-76-AD; Amendment 39-17872; AD 2014-12-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7122. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Phoenix, AZ [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0956; Airspace Docket No. 13-AWP-17] received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7123. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Applicable Federal Rates — September 2014 (Rev. Rul. 2014-22) received August 26, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7124. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Revenue Procedure: Rev. Proc. 2014-50 received August 26, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7125. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Health Insurance Providers Fee Notice 2014-47 received August 20, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MILLER of Florida: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 3593. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the construction of major medical facilities, and for other purposes (Rept. 113–586). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. UPTON: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 4771. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to more effectively regulate anabolic steroids; with an amendment (Rept. 113–587 Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GOODLATTE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4771. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to more effectively regulate anabolic steroids; with an amendment (Rept. 113–587 Pt. 2). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GOODLATTE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5108. A bill to establish the Law School Clinic Certification Program of the United States Patent and Trademark Office, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 113–588). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. S. 476. An act to amend the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal Development Act to extend to the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park Commission (Rept. 113–589). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. S. 1603. An act to reaffirm that certain land has been taken into trust for the benefit of the Match-E-Be-Nash-She-Wish Band of Pottawatami Indians, and for other purposes (Rept. 113–590). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 3006. A bill to authorize a land exchange involving the acquisition of private land adjacent to the Cibola National Wildlife Refuge in Arizona for inclusion in the refuge in exchange for certain Bureau of Land Management lands in Riverside County, California, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 113–591). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 4119. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study of the West Hunter Street Baptist Church in Atlanta, Georgia, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 113–592). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 5205. A bill to authorize certain land conveyances involving public lands in northern Nevada to promote economic development and conservation, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 113–593). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 4182. A bill to provide that the Ozark National Scenic Riverways shall be administered in accordance with the general management plan for that unit of the National Park System, and for other purposes (Rept. 113–594). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 3606. A bill to permit certain activities to be conducted on Federal land within the Emigrant Wilderness of Stanislaus National Forest in the State of California at the level at which such activities were conducted on such land before the wilderness designation, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. 113–595). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 2158. A bill to exempt from the Lacey Act Amendments of 1981 the expedited removal from the United States of certain snake species, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 113–596). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 4350. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to take lands and mineral rights on the reservation of the Northern Cheyenne Tribe of Montana and other culturally important lands into trust, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 113–597). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of Florida: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 4276. A bill to extend and modify a pilot program on assisted living services for veterans with traumatic brain injury; with an amendment (Rept. 113–598). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SMITH of Texas: Committee on Science, Space, and Technology. H.R. 2996. A bill to require the Secretary of Commerce to establish the Network for Manufacturing Innovation and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 113–599 Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. COLE: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 722. Resolution providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 124) making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2015, and for other purposes (Rept. 113–600). Referred to the House Calendar.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on Appropriations discharged from further consideration. H.R. 2996 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

TIME LIMITATION OF REFERRED BILL

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XII, the following action was taken by the Speaker:

[The following action occurred on September 12, 2014]

H.R. 1869. Referral to the Committee on Rules extended for a period ending not later than December 11, 2014.

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. TERRY (for himself, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. UPTON, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. FLORES, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. MARINO, Mrs. CAPITO, and Mr. MCKINLEY):

H.R. 2. A bill to remove Federal Government obstacles to the production of more domestic energy; to ensure transport of that energy reliably to businesses, consumers, and other end users; to lower the cost of energy to consumers; to enable manufacturers and other businesses to access domestically produced energy affordably and reliably in order to create and sustain more secure and well-paying American jobs; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Transportation and Infrastructure, the Judiciary, and Science, Space, and Technology, 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. CAMP (for himself, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. ISSA, Mr. GOODLATTE, and Mr. HENSARLING):

H.R. 4. A bill to make revisions to Federal law to improve the conditions necessary for economic growth and job creation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on the Budget, Oversight and Government Reform, Rules, the Judiciary, Financial Services, Agriculture, Natural Resources, and Small Business, 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. BARR (for himself, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia):

H.R. 5461. A bill to clarify the application of certain leverage and risk-based requirements under the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, to improve upon the definitions provided for points and fees in connection with a mortgage transaction, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, 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. HUDSON (for himself, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mr. RICHMOND):

H.R. 5462. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to provide for limitations on the fees charged to passengers of air carriers; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. COLLINS of Georgia:

H.R. 5463. A bill to suspend military assistance to countries that harbor persons that provide material or financial support to the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. LEE of California, and Mr. HONDA):

H.R. 5464. A bill making appropriations for Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BERA of California:

H.R. 5465. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand health savings accounts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. CHRISTENSEN:

H.R. 5466. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4500 Sunny Isle Shopping Center in Christiansted, St. Croix, United States Virgin Islands, as the ''Florence Louise Thomas Post Office''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. FRANKEL of Florida (for herself, Mr. CLEAVER, and Mr. CICILLINE):

H.R. 5467. A bill to enhance the capabilities of metropolitan planning organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. ISSA (for himself, Ms. BASS, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. BERA of California, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. CHU, Mr. COOK, Mr. COSTA, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DENHAM, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. FARR, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. HAHN, Mr. HONDA, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. LAMALFA, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, Mr. NUNES, Mr. PETERS of California, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. RUIZ, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. WATERS, and Mr. WAXMAN):

H.R. 5468. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1103 USPS Building 1103 in Camp Pendleton, California, as the ''Camp Pendleton Medal of Honor Post Office''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. LATTA:

H.R. 5469. A bill to prevent future propane shortages, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, 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 Mrs. MILLER of Michigan (for herself, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. BARBER, and Ms. CLARKE of New York):

H.R. 5470. A bill to clarify the grounds for ineligibility for travel to the United States regarding terrorism risk, to expand the criteria by which a country may be removed from the Visa Waiver Program, to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to submit a report on strengthening the Electronic System for Travel Authorization to better secure the international borders of the United States and prevent terrorists and instruments of terrorism from entering the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Homeland Security, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. MOORE (for herself, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. GIBSON, and Ms. FUDGE):

H.R. 5471. A bill to amend the Commodity Exchange Act and the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to specify how clearing requirements apply to certain affiliate transactions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, 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. STOCKMAN:

H.R. 5472. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service currently located at 16281 U.S. Highway 59 in Moscow, Texas, as the ''Anna Stepanovna Politkovskaya Memorial Post Office''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. STOCKMAN:

H.R. 5473. A bill to amend title 4, United States Code, to declare English as the official language of the Government of the United States, and for other purposes; 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. WILLIAMS (for himself and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H.R. 5474. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to impose a mileage-based user fee for mobile mounted concrete boom pumps in lieu of the tax on taxable fuels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CÁRDENAS (for himself, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. NORTON, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. VELA, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. COSTA, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. GALLEGO, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. SIRES, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Ms. MOORE, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. BECERRA, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. GARCIA, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. RUIZ, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. CUELLAR, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas):

H. Res. 723. A resolution recognizing Hispanic Heritage Month and celebrating the heritage and culture of Latinos in the United States and the immense contributions of Latinos to the United States; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee (for himself and Mr. MCINTYRE):

H. Res. 724. A resolution recognizing the historical links and friendship between Scotland and the United States and respectfully supporting a truly democratic process; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. ESTY:

H. Res. 725. A resolution commending the Departments of Defense and Veterans Affairs for their joint campaign to raise awareness during September, Suicide Prevention Month, to reduce suicide among members of the United States Armed Forces and veterans; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, 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.

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. TERRY:
H.R. 2.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Art. I, Sec. 8, Cl. 3, giving Congress the Power ''To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;''
By Mr. CAMP:
H.R. 4.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 5, Clause 2; Article 1, Section 8, Clauses 1, 3, and 18; and Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2.
By Mr. BARR:
H.R. 5461.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3
By Mr. HUDSON:
H.R. 5462.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article One, Section Eight:
''The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States . . .''
By Mr. COLLINS of Georgia:
H.R. 5463.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3
The Congress shall have Power To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.
By Ms. DELAURO:
H.R. 5464.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 9, Clause 7 and Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution of the United States.
By Mr. BERA of California:
H.R. 5465.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8
By Mrs. CHRISTENSEN:
H.R. 5466.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to the Congress under Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.
By Ms. FRANKEL of Florida:
H.R. 5467.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8 (Clauses 1, 3, 7, and 18) of the United States Constitution, which grants Congress the power to lay and collect taxes for the purpose of spending; to regulate commerce between the several states; and to establish post offices and post roads.
By Mr. ISSA:
H.R. 5468.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 7
By Mr. LATTA:
H.R. 5469.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, cl. 3
The Congress shall have the power . . . to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the states, and with Indian Tribes;
By Mrs. MILLER of Michigan:
H.R. 5470.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.
By Ms. MOORE:
H.R. 5471.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8
By Mr. STOCKMAN:
H.R. 5472.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8
''The Congress shall have 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 Department or Officer thereof.''
By Mr. STOCKMAN:
H.R. 5473.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1 Section 8
''The Congress shall have Power To . . . To establish an uniform Rule of Naturalization''
By Mr. WILLIAMS:
H.R. 5474.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1
The Congress shall have the power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts, and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 36: Mr. BISHOP of New York.
H.R. 279: Mr. ROKITA
H.R. 292: Mr. WELCH and Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 445: Ms. BROWN of Florida.
H.R. 460: Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 676: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 713: Mr. WALBERG, Mr. HANNA, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. NEAL, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. COLE.
H.R. 781: Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 901: Mr. THOMPSON of California.
H.R. 988: Mr. LIPINSKI.
H.R. 997: Mrs. BLACK.
H.R. 1015: Mr. SCHNEIDER.
H.R. 1150: Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD.
H.R. 1199: Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CUELLAR, and Mr. CARNEY.
H.R. 1249: Mr. BARBER and Mr. BARLETTA.
H.R. 1331: Mr. WILLIAMS.
H.R. 1429: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.
H.R. 1627: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 1666: Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. SABLAN, and Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 1696: Mr. DAINES.
H.R. 1761: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 1893: Mrs. NAPOLITANO and Ms. MATSUI.
H.R. 1979: Ms. KUSTER.
H.R. 1998: Mr. LANCE and Mr. BACHUS.
H.R. 2028: Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 2342: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 2384: Ms. KAPTUR.
H.R. 2415: Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 2483: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 2500: Mr. YOUNG of Indiana and Mr. WILLIAMS.
H.R. 2536: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. RUIZ, and Mr. ROGERS of Alabama.
H.R. 2591: Mr. BARTON.
H.R. 2619: Mr. CICILLINE and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 2663: Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.
H.R. 2692: Ms. DELAURO.
H.R. 2737: Mr. MCDERMOTT.
H.R. 2994: Mr. WITTMAN.
H.R. 2996: Ms. BONAMICI.
H.R. 3043: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.
H.R. 3367: Mr. NUNNELEE and Mr. BARLETTA.
H.R. 3382: Ms. CHU.
H.R. 3426: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 3465: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 3471: Mr. PERLMUTTER.
H.R. 3482: Mr. DIAZ-BALART.
H.R. 3662: Ms. MATSUI.
H.R. 3708: Mr. LANCE.
H.R. 3723: Mr. MEEKS, Ms. CHU, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, and Ms. WILSON of Florida.
H.R. 3742: Mr. CONAWAY and Mr. FLORES.
H.R. 3877: Mr. RUSH, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. WEBSTER of Florida.
H.R. 3955: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 4030: Mr. CLAWSON of Florida and Mr. JOLLY.
H.R. 4060: Mr. CONAWAY.
H.R. 4091: Mr. POSEY.
H.R. 4128: Ms. DELAURO and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 4137: Mr. BRADY of Texas.
H.R. 4158: Mr. STIVERS.
H.R. 4190: Mr. STIVERS, Mr. BARBER, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
H.R. 4227: Ms. SPEIER.
H.R. 4276: Ms. SINEMA.
H.R. 4284: Mr. GOSAR.
H.R. 4351: Mr. FOSTER and Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 4356: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 4510: Mr. UPTON and Mr. KENNEDY.
H.R. 4515: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts and Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H.R. 4547: Mr. BOUSTANY.
H.R. 4551: Mr. FITZPATRICK and Mr. HANNA.
H.R. 4574: Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 4577: Mr. COBLE, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, and Mr. HUELSKAMP.
H.R. 4659: Mr. MURPHY of Florida.
H.R. 4695: Mr. PETERS of Michigan.
H.R. 4714: Mr. CONNOLLY.
H.R. 4717: Mr. SMITH of Missouri.
H.R. 4727: Mr. HANNA.
H.R. 4740: Mr. KLINE, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. GUTHRIE, and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
H.R. 4814: Mr. COBLE and Mr. PETERS of Michigan.
H.R. 4833: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 4837: Mr. LEWIS.
H.R. 4920: Mr. ADERHOLT and Mr. MARINO.
H.R. 4930: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. COSTA, and Mr. NUNNELEE.
H.R. 4960: Mr. MEADOWS, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. CLAY, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. ENYART, Mr. JOYCE, Ms. MOORE, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, and Mr. SWALWELL of California.
H.R. 4969: Mr. YODER, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. ENGEL.
H.R. 4986: Mr. JOLLY.
H.R. 5000: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 5063: Ms. WILSON of Florida.
H.R. 5069: Mr. COTTON and Mr. RICHMOND.
H.R. 5095: Mr. ISRAEL and Ms. DUCKWORTH.
H.R. 5098: Mrs. LUMMIS and Mrs. BACHMANN.
H.R. 5128: Mr. NADLER, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. TAKANO, and Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 5145: Mr. COOPER.
H.R. 5170: Mr. CARTER.
H.R. 5183: Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.
H.R. 5190: Mr. LIPINSKI and Mr. STOCKMAN.
H.R. 5226: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, and Mr. JONES.
H.R. 5228: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 5231: Mr. COLLINS of New York.
H.R. 5233: Mr. KING of Iowa and Mr. MARINO.
H.R. 5252: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
H.R. 5267: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Mr. DEUTCH.
H.R. 5291: Mr. RICHMOND.
H.R. 5323: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 5327: Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 5328: Mr. TERRY.
H.R. 5353: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 5360: Mr. CLAWSON of Florida.
H.R. 5380: Ms. BORDALLO and Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 5392: Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. LAMALFA, and Mr. HURT.
H.R. 5403: Mr. HORSFORD and Mr. MATHESON.
H.R. 5408: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.
H.R. 5417: Mr. OLSON, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. HUELSKAMP, and Mr. FINCHER.
H.R. 5435: Mr. YODER.
H.R. 5439: Ms. NORTON, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Mr. JOYCE.
H.R. 5441: Mr. HANNA.
H.R. 5445: Mr. HIGGINS, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.J. Res. 50: Mr. SCHWEIKERT.
H. Res. 428: Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H. Res. 620: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. MCALLISTER, Mr. ROYCE and Mr. LAMALFA.
H. Res. 662: Mr. JOYCE.
H. Res. 707: Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. KIND, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. PITTS, Mr. DENT, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. POCAN, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. TONKO, and Mr. KLINE.
H. Res. 711: Mr. GRIMM, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. HANNA, Mr. PIERLUISI and Mr. MAFFEI.
H. Res. 720: Ms. WILSON of Florida.

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. UPTON

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Energy and Commerce in H.R. 2 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. CAMP

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Ways and Means in H.R. 4137, the Preserving Welfare for Needs Not Weeds Act, do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.